

OUTSMARTING THE PREDATOR, UNDOING THE HUNT

**DEFINING A BASELINE FOR A FEMINIST
PRACTICE IN SCREENWRITING**

TAIMI NEVALUOMA

MASTER'S THESIS

NOVEMBER 2019

AALTO UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF ART, DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE

DEPARTMENT OF FILM, TELEVISION AND SCENOGRAPHY

SCREENWRITING FOR FILM AND TELEVISION

Author Taimi Nevaluoma

Title of thesis Outsmarting the Predator, Undoing the Hunt – Defining a baseline for a feminist practice in screenwriting

Department Film, Television and Scenography

Degree programme Master's Programme in Screenwriting for Film and Television

Year 2019

Number of pages 66

Language English

Abstract

In this master's thesis, I dismantle the Hero's Journey, a widely used screenwriting paradigm that was commercialised by Joseph Campbell. It was Campbell's conviction that a woman's need to identify with the Hero on a personal level means she is confused about her gender and that women do not need to make a personal transformative journey. I compare this setting to what Maureen Murdock and Clarissa Pinkola Estés have written about the Hero and Heroine's Journey and use the research of Dean A. Miller to further proof how the Hero's Journey is masculine orientated on the expense of the female experience. All mentioned theorists have stumbled on how they address gender and it's meaning in their theory. The problematic terminology includes references to innate nature defined by gender and biological differences between men and women - but then again also claims on the model transcending gender or the model existing beyond gender differentiation, all in the interest of creating a universally applicable paradigm for screenwriting. I present alternative mythical stories where the active main character is a resourceful woman, who transforms from passive to active and address the ways femininity and masculinity are taught to us and what kind of structure this creates. Using these mythical stories and theory written about them as the base for feminist film theory brings more variables to the narrative tradition in addition to distinctions of hegemonic masculinity that usually define the main character of a film. In order for the Hero's journey to become truly universal, it needs to intrinsically contain the experience of women, people of color, working class people and other minorities instead of avoiding them.

Analysing Jordan Peele's *Get Out* with feminist narrative tools produced a context, where the meaning of gender truly dissapates, and the focus moves to not depicting gender norms, but rather the uneven distribution of power and means among people, spesifically among white supremacists and the African American minority. Even if the main character is assumed hetero male, Chris Washington struggles with feelings of inferiority and learns to outsmart his antagonist and unarm him by turning his own weakness into a strenght.

My core findings result to disregarding biological gender as the primary signifier of one's identity and it's meaning in the journey making narratives. The end goal is not to deny the existence of gender, but to challenge the spectrum gender is observed on. I wanted to acquire an alternative to this school of thought, and even when I appreciate the female orientated theory, the paradigms ambition to transcend gender remains incomplete. Proving that the existing data on male heroes escapes comprehension in regards to life's complexity allows the screenwriter to rephrase her tradition completely.

Keywords feminism, screenwriting, narrative theory, mythology

Tekijä Taimi Nevaluoma

Työn nimi Outsmarting the Predator, Undoing the Hunt – Defining a baseline for a feminist practice in screenwriting

Laitos Elokuvataiteen ja lavastustaiteen laitos

Koulutusohjelma Elokuva- ja TV-käsikirjoittamisen pääaine

Vuosi 2019

Sivumäärä 66

Kieli englanti

Tiivistelmä

Haastan tässä maisterin lopputyössä laaja-alaisesti alalla käytössä olevan Sankarin matka - analogian. Joseph Campbellin perintö perustuu osittain hänen näkemykseensä, jonka mukaan naisen ei tarvitse tehdä itse myyttistä matkaa, ja tämän halu samastua Sankariin kertoo hämmennyksestä omaa sukupuolta koskien. Vertailen tätä lähtökohtaa Maureen Murdockin ja Clarissa Pinkola Estésin kirjoituksiin Sankarin ja Sankarittaren matkoista. Osoitan Dean A. Millerin tutkimuksen avulla entisestään millä tavalla Sankarin matkan voi katsoa olevan sukupuolisesti vinoutunut naisen kokemuksen kustannuksella. Kaikki mainitut teoreetikot ovat omalta osaltaan kompuroineet käsitellessään sukupuolta ja sen merkitystä omassa työssään. Ongelmallinen terminologia sisältää oletuksia sukupuolen mukaan määräytyvästä "sisäisestä luonnosta" ja biologisista eroista miehen ja naisen välillä - toisaalta kaikki pyrkivät vakuuttamaan, että heidän toimintamallinsa ylittää sukupuolen merkityksen tai perustuu lopulta johonkin muuhun kuin sukupuoleen, ja takaa mahdollisuuden luoda universaalisesti sovellettavissa olevan ajatusmallin, jota soveltaa käsikirjoittamiseen. Esittelen joitakin vaihtoehtoisia myyttisiä tarinoita, joissa päähenkilö on aktiivinen ja neuvokas nainen, joka transformoituu passiivisesta aktiiviseksi toimijaksi, ja käsittelen myös tapaa millä naisellisuutta ja miehisyyttä opetetaan ja millaisia rakenteita tästä rakentuu. Myyttisten tarinoiden ja niistä kertovan teorian soveltaminen feministisessä kontekstissa synnyttää uusia muuttujia narratiiviseen perinteeseen hegemonisen maskuliinisuuden ominaisuuksien rinnalle. Jotta Sankarin matka -narratiivi voisi todella olla universaalinen ajatusmalli, tulisi sen rakenteellisesti huomioida myös naisten, rodullistettujen ihmisten, työväenluokan ja muiden vähemmistöjen kokemus, mitä sen voi katsoa kuitenkin vain välttelevän. Analysoin Jodan Peelen *Get Out* -elokuvan feministisen narratiivin valossa, mikä mahdollistaa keskittymään tarinan valtakenteisiin, tässä tapauksessa valkoiseen ylivaltaan ja afroamerikkalaiseen vähemmistöön, ilman että sukupuolinnormit sinänsä olisivat ratkaiseva tekijä tarinassa. Vaikka päähenkilö Chris Washington on miesoletettu hetero, hän taistelee sisäisen vähemmyyden tunteen kanssa, mutta päihittää lopulta vastustajansa älyllään ja kääntämällä heikkoutensa omaksi edukseen.

Olen naisin löydökseni on biologisen sukupuolen ohittaminen keskeisimpänä identiteetin määrittäjänä, myös myyttisessä tai symbolisessa matkanteon narratiivissa. Tarkoituksena ei ole kieltää sukupuolen olemassaoloa, vaan haastaa tapa, jolla sukupuolta tavallisesti tarkastellaan. Pyrkimykseni oli löytää ajatusmallille täydellisempi vaihtoehto ja vaikka pidänkin naisorientoitua teoriaa arvossa, sekään ei onnistu ylittämään sukupuolen merkitystä täysin. Sankarista kertova aineisto ei selvästi kata koko elämän kirjon monimuotoisuutta, ja tämän osoittaminen toivotavasti mahdollistaa, että käsikirjoittaja voi uudelleen asetella tarinankerronnan perinteen tarkoituksiinsa sopivaksi.

Avainsanat feminismi, käsikirjoittaminen, narratiiviteoria, mytologia

PREFACE
WHAT IS FEMINIST NARRATIVE?
PAGES 1-4

I: INTRODUCTION TO TOXIC MASCULINITY
DEFINING THE RESEARCH QUESTION AND THE FEMINIST SOURCE LIBRARY
PAGES 5-8

II: THE WOUNDED MASCULINITY
AND THE OPPRESSED FEMININITY

FIRST ESSAY
PAGES 9-19

III: WHY WE NEED MEN AND WOMEN
IS NOT WHY YOU THINK

SECOND ESSAY
PAGES 20-34

IV: JORDAN PEELE'S "GET OUT" AS AN EXAMPLE
OF A MODERN MASTERPIECE WITH INHERENTLY
INTERSECTIONAL MESSAGE

THE CASE STUDY
PAGES 35-58

V: ENLIGHTENMENT BEYOND GENDER

THE CONCLUSION CHAPTER
PAGES 59-64

SOURCES
PAGES 64-66

PREFACE

WHAT IS FEMINIST NARRATIVE?

In my bachelor thesis, I wrote about the practice of screenwriting, focusing on the writer's status in the team hierarchy and the history behind certain customs to working and performing as a writer on an advisable level. While circling on a new subject for this master thesis, I reread what I wrote, and found this little issue: *I am going to pass on going through some sort of short history on feminism, the acknowledging societal otherness and the effect of that position to the global female psyche. Not because it's not due or because it's not true, but in the context of my thesis I cannot say women's movement has any causation to my life as a writer. -- Why don't I love my female character? Not once did I feel proud of her. Do I need to? Was she too much like me? Not that she really acted in a way I identified with - just her being a woman was enough. I tried making my character into a woman I could respect. When writing a male character, I root for him - he is a dream I have for myself. I wish I was bold and self-sufficient like him, selfish like him - and broken like him. Basically me, but resilient. This is an identity crisis. I didn't like myself, so I couldn't like the female character. I spend months on obsessing over her psychology - what was I really doing?*

Despite having a sliver of self reflection in my bachelor thesis, I was essentially fully engulfed in a status quo where it is normal to feel inferior as a female and simply blind in terms of looking for a solution to neither my mental health problems¹ or the ridiculously narrow depiction of female characters in cinema. This is why it is so easy for us women to identify with male characters of films and while it is possible for us to be engaged in men's stories, these depictions

¹ If you treat people around you in a civilized manner, but find yourself thinking you are less than others, that is mental illness.

don't actually help us change anything, but actually just protect the system of adoring unworthy men on the expense of sharing power with women.

I am a millennial (someone born in between the years 1981 and 1996), and for the past 10 years, I've glanced, rolled and binged over a library full of blog posts of either women, who are desperately trying to find their purpose and identity from marketing consumer products, such as make-up and clothes, or selling some form of pseudo-enlightened forced positivity all the while having little to nothing to smile about. Phrases like "learning to love yourself" from someone who can't take out the trash without putting lipstick on - just for the thrill of having that characteristic - seemed deeply falseful. If you are clinically depressed, no amount of journaling, self-dating or self-rewarding will not change the fact. I am closing in on 30 years on the planet, I've sat in therapy for years and popped enough pills and chugged down enough bottles of wine to really be done with my victimhood. It is easier to do when you know that there is a whole nation of women doing the same thing. Even one year ago, writing these sentences with the knowing that this essay is available to anyone visiting the university database, would have felt impossible. Just admitting that I am deeply disappointed to a system of men was not conceivable, because anything that might upset them, anger them or make them walk out on me was terrifying. And I don't know what has happened since then, except for writing this thesis. *Touché*.

It's not that pretty, obviously. Actually, what I wrote above is essentially as much nonsense as the importance of a perfect eyeshadow. It's nonsense in a sense that I really think I've processed or solved any of my issues, or any issues whatsoever. I didn't transform myself from sad to happy by graduating. Half of the time I have no idea what I am doing or why I'm feeling the way I do. I am not a neurotic personality, but in many ways I am holding on to invisible things, basing

my world on things that are not quantifiable. But bless my soul, I'm a screenwriter, not a psychologist or a historian. I would be horribly tied to a demand for certainty, God forbid.

I am white, I am educated, a sort of a dream product of "socialism", someone, who gained her position and education without performing any sexual acts or paying a single bill. Essentially, I am just like a man. I am a prince! Nothing is stopping me! This is why I can't just sit here pointing at things I don't like, expecting a line of allies to follow me, and some attentive king to listen to me and grant me my wishes. I have to do more than that. I have to hand in my proposal. After handing in this theoretical master thesis about film making and feminism, I am going to graduate as a master of cinema art to a better world for filmmakers of all kinds, than I would have in the year I started school. Feminism seems to be on everyone's lips. Film makers want gender equality in the work life itself and the audiences wish to see more credible and politically woke stories on screen.

But what does this really require? What really is feminist cinema? This thesis is comprised of an introduction chapter, two essays, a case study and the conclusion chapter, where I attempt to answer at least some of these questions: is it "feminist enough" that the main character of the film is a woman? Is she the suppressed one, merely surviving rather than thriving? Is she brutalized, and if so, can she heal? What kind of depiction can be seen as truthful and not exploitative at the same time? Can male directors and other allies ever really create content that upholds these requirements?

I confess that my goal is predetermined as I attempt present some sort of baseline for what is feminist film narrative as opposed to what you can call the mainstream cinema. I am more at peace with my profession now that I know what sort of theory and psychological mechanisms lie behind our narrative tradition. The fact remains, there are stories to be told and there is ignorance to be addressed. Filmmakers work in a value system. The infrastructure required and the mere

employance of a film crew guarantees that consumer attractive film work will always cost a lot of money. And when you use a lot of money, you might want to address issues that are as global as the market distribution. In the Western societies we are spared a lot of humane suffering what with all our commodities and civil rights, but it is not like this in most of the world. Most of the world pays for our comfort. There are so many matrixes, so many levels of consciousness. There is a golden streak to follow, where an artist can be expressive, precise, on the side of the underdog, depending on our shared ability for empathy. Empathy is a muscle that *can* be trained. I cringe whenever I hear anyone saying how they feel like they are so much more empathetic than everyone else - mentioning such a thing only reveals how self-centered and self-observing you are. If you are truly empathetic, turn your eyes to something other than a mirror reflection of yourself. Look at someone else. Look at the other. They will reflect you back to yourself, just as sharply and accurately as a mirror. Don't wait for spoken validation, don't count on validation at all. If you've done your job well, validation will never come to you. Remembering the definition of the quest hero Dean A. Miller proposes, a hero *"being detached from the "societal matrix" -- is often as dangerous to the social fabric as he is useful in defending it as a warfighter"*² while according to James Agee, *"a good artist is a deadly enemy of society; -- No society, no matter how good, could be mature enough to support a real artist without mortal danger to that artist. Only no one need to worry: for this same good artist is about the one sort of human being alive who can be trusted to take care of himself."*³

It remains to be seen, whether one can really create a hero and be a good artist at the same time.

² Miller 2002, 164.

³ Agee 1976, 323.

I

INTRODUCTION TO TOXIC MASCULINITY

DEFINING THE RESEARCH QUESTION AND THE FEMINIST SOURCE LIBRARY

I studied for a semester in Hungary back in 2018, where I had the most amazing ancient drama teacher. He was a brilliant lecturer, both entertaining and also really knew how to present his extensive subject matter in a way that could lead to a constitutive understanding. What stuck with me then was the narrative tools the writers of the Ancient era used to tell their stories and how their tradition still affects the craft to this day. If a story opens up on not in the present day, but with a preface of a curse of the ancestors, it is pretty safe to assume that the main character is someone who is chosen to fulfill a destiny. He has no say over this protocol and none of his choices in the past or in the immediate future matter. Gladly he is usually equipped with a rather serious stack of arms and other resources, even supernatural aids. More and more often this archetypal character in cinema is a woman - but regardless of their gender, they are a hero. According to more recent narrative studies, the Hero's journey is proposed to be gender biased to a point where using it as a tool can mean to be complicit to the upholding of a suffocating patriarchal system.

While we are on the subject, I should clarify my stance: there is nothing inherently wrong with men, or even with the definition of patriarchy. Patriarchy is not a curse word that in itself means something horrible - but there is everything wrong with the acquired, narrow manifestation of masculinity within the patriarchy. The powerful hegemony formed and enforced means a systematic force feeding of that definition, and it actually hurts men too, the very people it was meant to benefit and the rest of us are collateral damage of their effort to isolate power.

When a male filmmaker writes and shoots a story about a man, the women he dreams into existence might have a very shallow personality and may act on a very narrow path, opposing men, wanting men, always existing in relation to men. Around the world, men live in a place of higher power compared to women, and make more films than women. They set the bar, the base and the formula for storytelling. So far, white hetero men have not astounded me in the way they handle the critique of fourth wave feminists. They have been left alone on their own devices, to decide for all of us. They have failed us. They are scared of what's going to happen to them in the future. They are ready to fight, and so are we. Us feminists want to see more feministic content. We want women to rise up. We want to mock men to further prove how infuriating it is to be portrayed incorrectly, what it feels like to live up to a reflection that is set by someone who does not respect you as a whole person, but as a member of the opposing sex, as an object of sexual desire, as someone who is there to nurture men, is there to listen and not demand, who's job it is to be soft when they are hard.

Just relax. Not to say I am kidding – above I want to illustrate the general tone and level of everyday discourse. I do not appreciate the term 'toxic' as qualifying term when discussing gender and power, or masculinity to be exact. Toxic is a scientific term, which refers to a poisonous substance. I can understand its vernacular meaning, but still, any behaviour can be toxic. Qualifying certain behaviour as toxic, assumes that there is another side that is poisoned, sick, perhaps in capable of functioning. Victimized, paralyzed. Passive. I have a hard time admitting that, so I will not go out of my way to prove the existence of the problem, but just assume it as a default.

Acknowledging the hegemony of masculinity, on the other hand, hits closer to home. Jennifer Siebel Newsom's documentary *The Mask You Live In* (2015) defines the attributes of

'hyper genders', where only the characteristics at the very ends of the masculine-feminine definitions apply. A hyper man doesn't talk, doesn't cry. He is either the victim of society or captivated by his childhood traumas, and can't think for himself or make autonomous decisions. There is also hyper femininity, but it is harder to observe objectively because this narrow manifestation of femininity can always be seen as a by product of said masculine phenomenon.

With this being said, it very well might be that there are no such things as femininity and masculinity. It might be, that those are products of hegemonic thinking, the endless aristotelian quest for one truth, and for one truth only. If there truly is a notable divergence between the image of woman and human reality, like Betty Friedan suggested⁴, it means that we *do* live in a lie, that *like poison* ruins our lives.

Maureen Murdock and Clarissa Pinkola Estés have written about the Hero and Heroine's Journey, and through their writing, I will represent the legacy of Joseph Campbell and Christopher Vogler. I use the research of Dean A. Miller to further proof how the Hero's Journey is masculine orientated, because Campbell and Vogler never wanted to admit such a thing. I am also going to add on to what Helen Jacey has established in her article and her book about writing women characters in movies, as her research is also greatly influenced by Estés and Murdock. In her book, *Women who run with the wolves* (1992), Estés represents a series of myths where the active main character is a resourceful woman, who transforms from passive to active. Using these myths as the base for feminist film theory brings more variables to the narrative tradition. I also reference to writers like Paul Mason, Reni Eddo-Lodge, Roxanne Gay and Audre Lorde who are not film theorists, but who have defined the way we perceive and distribute value, both literal financial value and the inherent, moral justifications that define our lives.

⁴ Friedan 2010, 47.

I will not attempt to compose my own version of the journey-making analogy, but rather express my contempt for any narrative that could solely be defined by the gender of the one who embarks upon the transformative journey. Instead of talking about heroes and heroines, we should talk about power, about oppression, about hunters and the hunted. Equality among people will always be a result of knowing, intent thinking and thus it will never be a given. I will recap the essential historical narrative theories and contemplate how they have survived so long untouched. The film industry is always operated primarily as a business venture rather than an artistically meritorious undertaking, which I will demonstrate by representing the origins of the hero and the relevance of the narrative it produces and how it perhaps affects the mentality of what can scarcely be called a 'modern' man or a woman of today. I dive into what it means to consider biology as the sole indicator of one's destiny or purpose in life. Finally, I create a positive reinforcement on how feminist, anti-discriminative message transforms into a best selling film master piece.

II

THE WOUNDED MASCULINITY AND THE OPPRESSED FEMININITY

FIRST ESSAY

To this day, most of the world's film schools start with the same two basic books, and Aalto University did not stray from their path either. These books are Joseph Campbell's *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (1949) and Christopher Vogler's *The Writer's Journey: Mythic Structure For Writers* (1992). Campbell was an anthropologist, who made the white, post-enlightened reader once again aware of the Monomyth and its ritualistic mechanisms. Vogler is a screenwriter and a development executive, who commercialized and mass produced Campbell's teachings. His practice has lead to the formula becoming wildly successful around the world. Supposedly using the paradigm is so effective because it is based on our ancient heritage. We are doing something that we always have done. This is then rewarded with commercial success⁵.

Being entertained by cinema is not an empty objective. Cinema closes in on fine art when it lingers in you. You enter a realm, where you are transformed to another stage, whether you appreciate that analogy or criticize the desecularization of the phenomenon. You are sitting still, and even when you yourself do not experience life, you feel along the characters the story, and you think about them like they were real people. Before you enter the cinema, you pay for your ticket, you give a sacrifice, you commit to the cause. The hope is that when you go back home, it will happen with an emotion or a thought, an idea that you will want to integrate into your life. Spiritual contemplation can become useless escapism without the integration of the experience.

⁵ Jacey 2010a, 311.

This is the reason we rewatch films, to go back to that certain place. True artists are defined by creating classics, works that present stories that stand time, that we want to relive. These powerful experiences are what makes filmmaking a good business.

Aiming for the universality of a story aims to maximize profits. Film industry, just like any other capital-intensive system, can be seen to be subjected to this effort. This is why we must remain vigilant about human rights, because capitalist rule creates a justice system that protects capital, and not people. While it seems we have evolved to accept that women are just as worthy as men, matter of factly such realization was an after-thought to harnessing cheap workforce. When men left for the World Wars, women took their place in factories and in agriculture and because they were not educated or experienced, their salaries were just cents of the dollar. De-skilling the workforce is a rouse of the capitalist that they sometimes have to use in order to inject liveliness to a stale system, but this time, the idea was conceived by a natural occurrence in the workforce.⁶ What seemed to be the one good thing to come out of the world wide crises was a perfect way to cut cost.⁷ The capitalist cannot afford the workforce⁸, and the gender, or the color of the skin of the worker, even their educational background, is just an excuse not to hire them.

Paul Mason of course writes about the history and future of capitalism and not about human rights, women's issues or the black movement – it all delves in the background. It cannot be seen or heard, it's rather a taste in the air. Audre Lorde said it best: *"In a society where the good is defined in terms of profit rather than in terms of human need, there must always be some group of people who, through systematized oppression, can be made to feel surplus, to occupy the place of dehumanized inferior. Within this society, that group is made of Black and Third World*

⁶ Mason 2016, 73.

⁷ Mason 2016, 74-75, 80.

⁸ Mason 2016, 90-91.

people, working-class people, older people and women.”⁹ As women, other gender minorities and people of color gain equity, they also have more power as consumers. Stories written for the oppressed, or just the privileged but benevolent consumers, are now making profits, but the consumer’s power is still rather purported. When the sole action you can take towards change is to decide how you will spend your money, you are a mere cog in a neo-liberalist machine. Even if films like *Black Panther* (2018) or *Wonder Woman* (2017) make sales and win awards, we cannot assume that we are thus equal. The market realities of any single film is an indicator of nothing other than the market reality of said certain film.

How is it possible, that women are considered inferior beings in large parts of the world?

The assumption, that masculine means something active, while femininity means something passive, is exhausting, and I find it endlessly uninteresting to research it’s origins. I have a feeling it is explained once again with biology. I understand that breeding for men requires knowing action, while gestating their seed is indeed possible for women without taking any action at all. This ignorance of considering this analogy as relevant lies in the core of our narrative tradition to this day. The assumption of women as lesser creatures has been challenged provably since 1792, when Mary Wollstonecraft wrote the *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. The whole layout for the conversation about two genders, not to mention genders beyond the two polarities, is ineffective, and Murdock argued already 29 years ago, that the masculine is actually not a gender at all, but an archetypal force. Men are not masculine agents that dominate us because it is in their blood. The masculine nature resides in all things, but it has been robbed and ripped out of the rest of us who are not men. It is wounded, unbalanced and has become destructive.¹⁰ Women

⁹ Lorde 2007, 114.

¹⁰ Murdock 1990, 156.

have been taught to comply not only to serve men but to save their own lives. Women should be taught how to defend themselves against a destructive masculine force. It is not a part of anyone's identity to be shy, timid and objective to a point of passivity. When we assume these inherit human qualities are defined by our gender, we create a world based on individual beliefs rather than common ground and fact.

Having gender equity somewhere but not everywhere is not enough. When feminism is the frontier of the privileged, it cannot be said to be functioning properly, the way it was meant to. Were the underdogs to form a weighing front, it would be considered as a legitimate threat to the existing societal order. There really is no place for men's men and exceedingly feminine women in the contemporary world. There is also no quantifiable threat to the status quo of biological nuclear family. The definite existence of the hetero norm on the expense of everything else again does threat diversity. Science or art that fortifies hetero fundamentalism amputates thinking and dehumanizes people who do not identify accordingly. Feminism and the black movement is charged with reactive distress, that is easy to dismiss by the ones who do not feel it.

As a means to demonstrate that we need to educate ourselves in relation to the oppressed femininity and the wounded masculinity, I refer to a lecture I attended in September 2018.¹¹ A filmmaker and an instructor of Bilkent University, Fulten Larlar, lectured about hegemonic masculinity depicted in *The Star Wars* films. She referenced to Nick Trujillo's research as to define distinctions of hegemonic masculinity, which are physical force, occupational achievement (justly acquired or not), familial patriarchy, frontiersmanship and heterosexuality¹². Larlar then added a sixth distinction: *the avoidance of responsibility*. In the core of the fandom phenomenon of Star Wars are male fans who embrace a narrative where the main character is seduced to evil, where

¹¹ Screenwriting Research Network's conference in Milan, Italy. 13th to 15th of September, 2018.

¹² Trujillo 1991, 290-308.

their mental pain is so grave it becomes humanly impossible to resist the urge to commit violence. The new trilogy represents the character of Kylo Ren who is constantly compelled to turn back to the Light's side, an instinct he compulsive overrides as an attempt to make an autonomous decision. He emphasizes his knowing intentions by committing more and more violent crimes, and fades out the meaning of emotional outbursts in his decision making. Sound familiar? Audre Lorde knew this: in order to maintain their position of power, the oppressor cannot admit to any wrongdoing or mistakes, which is why they evade responsibility for their own actions. This is how it becomes the responsibility of the oppressed to teach the oppressors their mistakes¹³.

I know. It's exhausting work. But it needs to be done, and it's not *that* exhausting.

If men are in fact emotionally unstable and their psyches are mutilated and bleeding, it would be stupid to follow their lead and trust them to know anything about leading nations or people.¹⁴

What is the alternative medicine in this scenario?

Maureen Murdock, a jungian psychotherapist, wrote her groundbreaking book *The Heroine's Journey* in 1990. Her incentive for this work was in part due to her interview with Joseph Campbell's and his stance about women and The Hero's Journey. While interviewing him in 1981, she learned that according to Campbell, women have a part in the mythological tradition as the ultimate boon, the price, the bargaining chip, the highest reward. A woman's need to identify with the hero on a personal level means she is confused about her gender and in fact they do not personally need to make the journey at all.¹⁵ Murdock's theory is supposed to work as a counter word for Campbell, so her theories clearly attempt to match his. It can be said that women are

¹³ Lorde 2007, 114-115.

¹⁴ Please, don't take yourself so seriously, it might harm your credibility.

¹⁵ Murdock 1990, 2.

instructed to be servile in a way that acquires and includes identifying as inferior in relation to men. Murdock addresses the traits and ways femininity and masculinity are taught to us and what kind of structure this creates. For me to dismantle these things is like tearing down historical statues. It does not serve us in the long haul to forget them.

In Plato's *Symposium*, Eryksimakhos tells a story of gender separation. According to his tale, human beings used to be round shaped creatures who moved by rolling. They were incredibly capable, strong and ambitious and the Gods were afraid they would rise up and defy them. Since without humans the Gods would have no one to praise them, Zeus then split people into two, instead of destroying humans all together. These split sides were left on Earth, always looking for one another. The rant includes numerous examples and explanations on the search for ones matching side, commenting on things such as infidelity and the reasoning for continuing the human race.¹⁶ Why I am even bringing it up, is to present an ancient example of what it does, in a man's opinion, to search for wholeness. The "theory" is thoroughly heterosexual and claims that in order for a person to be whole, they need another person, a person of the opposite sex.

The patriarch teaches that truly feminine women do not want civil rights, or to educate themselves, or work up to a career of significance. The image of a perfect American housewife, who has found fulfilment in raising children and helping her husband, is what Betty Friedan refers as the core of "feminine mystique". Friedan published her book *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963. She started her work by surveying her own classmates of Smith college and continued to interview women of her generation for a decade. Her research evidently debunked the assumption on women finding fulfillment while tending to their husbands and rearing children as their sole purpose in life¹⁷. The title refers to the endlessly mysterious origin of what explains why women

¹⁶ Plato 1999, 102-106.

¹⁷ Friedan 2010, 5.

are the way they are, while coincidentally being what men want them to be - their inferior, that is.

*"Nobody argued whether women were inferior or superior to men; they were simply different."*¹⁸

This feminine mystique was supposed to be the reward for women, but as Friedan concluded, it turned out to be their problem, and source of their unhappiness¹⁹. The creator of the American housewife image was a man, returning from war, hoping for someone to take care of him and secure his cosy domestic bliss.²⁰ Aspiration for said image was to ensure the need for consumer goods, such as household appliances and beauty products. This was not just a million dollar business, but propaganda, that worked simply because *"women no longer know who they are."*²¹ Friedan's book revolutionized at least a certain margin inside the U.S. society, completing the task of second wave feminism, which set on to argue that a woman's need to express themselves freely does not pose a threat to femininity, nor does her need to identify through her actions and work destroy masculinity.²² Women are not envious because they are not like men; women are envious because they are enslaved.²³ Friedan writes, *"I think women had to suffer this crisis of identity -- simply to become fully human."*²⁴

Does this bring something to mind?

What does it mean to start off from a place of ignorance, complaisance and immaturity, to realize it, accept it to be true, move on to disposing, disarming it and finally acquiring your identity as the ultimate boon? Does this in fact suggest that the Hero's journey is actually not men's journey at all? That it is actually the female's journey? And perhaps the men do not make the

¹⁸ Friedan 2010, 8.

¹⁹ Friedan 2010, 7-8.

²⁰ Friedan 2010, 37-38.

²¹ Friedan 2010, 53.

²² Friedan 2010, 41.

²³ Friedan 2010, 29.

²⁴ Friedan 2010, 59-62.

journey at all, because, in all seriousness, what's their problem? Nothing is stopping them from getting exactly what they want! Except if they are gay, people of color, or workers... Meaning: unless they are somehow systematically oppressed.

Helen Jacey gave me the most important tools that I needed in order to write about men and women in film narrative, or rather the ostensible definitions of heroes and heroines. In her 2010 *Journal of Screenwriting* article, *The hero and heroine's journey and the writing of "Loy"*, Jacey notes that Murdock too uses problematic terminology in her writing as she states that women have an innately feminine nature, due to biological difference while simultaneously claiming the model to transcend gender.²⁵ Vogler also claims that his paradigm for transformational journey is "beyond gender differentiation" - but then contradicts himself by suggesting that women make the journey inwards, to themselves, before emerging to the world as whole people, rather than separate from the community and lead a quest for the one boon, returning as masters of life and death. Vogler attempts to present an "universally applicable" paradigm for screenwriting, but also admits that readers will benefit from reading Murdocks and Estes's books that are written by women about women, and are specified to a "woman's point of view"²⁶. Clarissa Pinkola Estés writes about mythical characters, the friends and foes of one's psyche, and while she heavily addresses "women's internal journey" in her book, according to her these ancient stories can resonate with "both genders."²⁷ While Estés writes about women being wild and intuitive to a point of exhaustion, on the other hand her message can be empowering when considering what it means to be "civilized". A civil person is a member of society, who lives

²⁵ Jacey 2010a, 313-314.

²⁶ Vogler 2007, xxi-xxii.

²⁷ Estés 1997, 44.

according to the laws of the state, follows a rule. Does not think for herself or question the iniquities she witnesses. Who wants to be civilized anyway?

The idea that these missions of separation or wholeness are assigned to us in the moment when the doctor takes a look at our genitals and declares our gender, is so problematic. There is always the possibility that the outer or inner genitalia is a mix of both of the two reproducing sexes. Another possibility is that the gender between the ears contradicts the one between the legs. I do not intend to debate the spectrum of gender formations, I am here to question the inherent difference of a feminine or a masculine journey. What there is, is power and oppression. These are things that are actually assigned to us when we are assigned gender or race. The narrative becomes specific when it fleshes out the point of view of a person, who is being persecuted by a beast stronger than herself, for reasons she cannot control, due to attributes she was born with. Reni Eddo-Lodge addresses a similar issue in her 2017 book *Why I no longer talk to white people about race*. When power and privilege is bestowed on certain race, class and gender and not on personal merits and traits, insisting on one paradigm for all without acknowledging said variables will do nothing to deconstruct an unjust or inaccurate system.²⁸

I make the mistake of not seeing race all the time. I wake in the morning, get out of bed, look at myself in the mirror and walk out the door - sometimes it takes me the whole day to ever consider my skin tone. I am privileged, and every time I forget the fact that I am, it means I am ignorant, and part of the problem. I live in Helsinki, the capital of Finland, one of the most gender equal countries in the world. Sometimes there are several days in a row where no one comments or assigns my gender to me, it simply does not come up as a factor in interactions. Part of my instinct for writing this thesis was my stated identification as someone who is not a victim of the

²⁸ Eddo-Lodge 2018, 84.

system. I am a highly educated white woman who gets to make films and write about cinema. I am not forced to have kids, no one makes my decisions for me. If I settle for a comfortable life as a vigorous pet of the patriarchy, and exclude race from my thesis, I will fail as a feminist. As Audre Lorde writes, "*as a tool of social control, women have been encouraged to recognize only one area of human difference as legitimate, those differences which exist between women and men.*"²⁹ And not race or class. Thank you, sister. This is what I am talking about when I am talking about *Get Out* as the great modern feminist film. This is why I stress that we have to move on from the idea of just a male and female journey. There are hunters and there are prey. This is what we need to talk about.

There is quite possibly no way to indefinitely move on from dualism, even if one might believe that separation between living beings is a lie.³⁰ The basis of human intellect is the understanding that if we can remember the past and plan for the future, so can other living beings around us. We all have a sense of self and equal value. If we didn't realise the line between us, we would never have an end to conflict while attempting to align the world to what we think to be the one sensible way to be. A terrorist is someone who lives in an intellectual asphyxiation, where he does not accept or respect this truth even when he is perfectly capable of doing so.

The white hetero man needs to stop wanting things, like more land, more financial liquidity or access to a woman's vagina on command. He needs to stop thinking he is entitled to them. He needs to work his way to all these things to deserve them, to deserve his privilege and other

²⁹ Lorde 2007, 122.

³⁰ Murdock 1990, 169-171. "*We live in a dualistic culture which values, creates and sustains polarities - an either/or stratified mentality which identifies and locates ideas and people at opposite ends of a spectrum. --The sin behind all sin is dualism: separation from self, separation from the divine, separation of me and you, separation of good from evil, separation of the sacred from nature. --We treat the other as an object outside of ourselves, some thing to better, to control, to distrust, to dominate, or to own. --- (The Bible's) Genesis -- states that men should rule over women, was not a divine decree but a piece of patriarchal propaganda.*"

people's trust. That is his mission, that is his boon. This elixir is not money, power or people ("helpless" women and children). This is why no woman can merely enjoy being the boon, the target of desire. That seat has already been taken. The only ultimate boon is to be a better person.

If you are a victim, you think like a victim. If you release your past from defining you, you think like the Creator³¹. The authoritative figures that define our film narratives have enforced the audience with violently incorrect definitions of what it is to be a man or a woman in this world. They will never admit this, no matter how hard we cry. It is O.K. for us to move on without them, it is possible for us to create a new world order without their permission.

³¹ I supposedly thought this by myself, but I'm pretty sure it derived from the Bible.

III
WHY WE NEED MEN AND WOMEN
IS NOT WHY YOU THINK
SECOND ESSAY

In the previous chapter I attempted to define the problem at hand: what has been written about narrative theory in relation to women and how deeply rooted is our lack of respect for women. Defining the current gender mythos reveals it to be strickly male-orientated, creating stories that will personally resonate with few and enforce hetero normative behaviour, habits and a culture that can be defined as misogynist. I do not aim to focus on the possibly narrow depiction of women but the similarly suffocating model of a man. This is the common critique some men have for feminists; how feminists supposedly focus only on women's issues and how this supposedly precludes the movement from creating "real equality". Men are obviously hurt by the system powerful men have created for them and they need to be saved from it as much as the women need to. Don't threat brothers, help is on the way.

In order to do this I have to assume a not-so-hypothetical claim inbedded in our societal mentality. This is something that is difficult to establish since it's origins are hard to pinpoint. It is the invisible state of truth that explains not only the way we tell stories in cinema, but how we perceive each other in our lives. This is about how it goes: men hoisted to represent all humankind in cinema because men are naturally more equipped to protect the human civilization than women, and we should acknowledge and praise their efforts when credit is due. There are things that just inherently don't belong to women's world.

By the end of this chapter I aim to suggest a more permissive view on both genders and how our biological gender should not become our destiny, and how forcing it harms us and upholds a world that inherently is untruthful and miserable.

The classical Hero's Journey follows the path of a religious ritual, where we transport ourselves to a reality beyond our senses. This should not merely lead us out of our rational world into a magical realm of super-human saviours and monsters. In order to fight an overwhelming oppression or enemy, we need to broaden our minds and sometimes create the solution out of thin air, turn an abstraction into reality. First, there is peace on earth, then there is a creation of a problem. That problem needs to be solved. This solution is discovered from the previously unknown, the abstraction is fleshed out and brought to the realm of reality. We mingle between the world of the matter and imagination. When narrative is stripped to the bone, we find dilemma. This is true. There is no need to contest it.

Dean A. Miller, a professor of history and comparative religion, defines a hero in his 2000 book *The Epic Hero*. A hero is an individual who accomplishes success in a demanding and difficult situation. He is not only excellent, but abnormal in his behaviour and usually operates despite a risk of his own life. Hero does not seek old age but to die a good death, most commonly in war. They seek fame and praise, which in effect will make them immortal. A storyteller keeps them alive in order to make sense of their dying and the choices that lead them to death. This is how a hero becomes a man between two worlds, and the storyteller becomes someone who communes with the dead.³²

³² Miller 2002, 1-5.

Miller writes with spectacular clarity and his tale summaries deserve no criticism. His book is extensive and pleasant to read. Everything he writes, he means. He does not flirt, mock, reveal or imagine. He recites what he has learned and what anyone could learn while attaining his superb education. He is a scholar, he does not judge his data, he does not create. His book is a typology, a map rather than a spell or song with an intended message. He writes about an epic hero, not a mythic hero. To my slight amusement Miller has a pretty open distrust towards Joseph Campbell and his *"significant error built into his Jungian attribution"*, as Miller himself considers Sigmund Freud, the discoverer of the Unconscious, to be the more reliable theorist, less *"mystical and irrational"*. According to Miller, Campbell inflated, desecularized and apotheosized the heroic role, and mocks the didactic and hieratic overtone of his language. Miller himself writes about a hero as a projection of mind who/that has *"no unconscious at all or even much of a mind"*, while Carl Gustave Jung and his successors look for a mythography, where the individual is *"laden with the cargo of the myth to explain the active processes of psychic maturation and individuation."* Miller slams his predecessors works for being *"full of false or fantasized data and historical impossibilities"* as the scholars *"are, in fact, best described as quirky if not downright eccentric"* and most of their work is considered to be anthropologically debunked, with little research merit, while their value to the tradition of said research evidently does amount to something.³³

When a white man studies religion, magic and witchcraft in a library with a sober head, he can be equipped to acquire data, but his mission of understanding and depicting it truthfully is never a given. But not to matter - his view on the subject and everything he has accomplished might still serve as a fertile material in creating a fiction. A screenwriter is demanded to not only quantify, but qualify the hero. A screenwriter can and should consider the cargo of the myth in

³³ Miller 2002, 62-69.

relation to her work. Reading Miller did serve as a disciplinary measure to one writing their master thesis. There is a risk being taken and a peril to face while creating a narrative out of any experience. War is war, murder is murder, past is past *is past* - but narratives are created, they are always fictitious.

With this in mind, Miller navigates through the lifespan of a hero and he focuses on everything but women while covering the parentage and lineage of the hero. The birthing mother doesn't deserve a subtitle of her own, while Father, Mother's Brother, Animal companions, Birth Mates (siblings) and Chariots do.³⁴ In the Freudian practise, a woman is either an overprotective or rejective mother, either nagging or shrewish wife, either a frigid or promiscuous female, a cause of homosexuality, impotence, neurosis and suicidality.³⁵ Only when covering triads, Miller offers "a female player providing esoteric advice and assistance" to the hero.³⁶ Hero has animal companions which are either domesticated (horse, dog) or malignant (wolf packs, bears). While wolves all and all present a feral power, a single wolf bitch can be a nurturing figure to the hero, as it was in the case of the founders of Rome, Remus and Romulus, who according to legend were raised by a wolf and not a human woman.³⁷ A snake is seen as a surprisingly positive figure who scares away other beasts and "heals wounds".³⁸ Miller does not reference the myth of the Original sin, as he disregards Christian myths in general. After all, it was a woman who offered the man the apple in the garden, and not the snake. Either hero considers animals to have human characteristics, and if not, characteristics not suited for the hero.³⁹

³⁴ Miller 2002, 70-132.

³⁵ Friedan 2010, 151.

³⁶ Miller 2002, 108.

³⁷ Miller 2002, 79.

³⁸ Miller 2002, 73-74.

³⁹ Miller 2002, 81.

Hero can not be a King, a signification Miller emphasizes while covering the Oedipus tale, the incest story being the closest he circles around addressing the biological Mother.⁴⁰ Heroes can be born of mortal men and women or immortal Gods and Goddesses, and usually the Goddess Mother might deserve her story to echo through the ages - she is not a human woman, after all, but a creation of male artistry. Miller also states that while the rivalry between the heroic son and his father is considered inevitable, it is rarely fatal to the father, so the Oedipus tale escapes definition of heroic setting in more ways than one. Hero is not a shaman, either. The stage of liminality (*limen* (latin) = threshold) means a place in between stages, where the *mythic* hero transforms into something else. Liminality is always a dangerous zone that cannot be inhabited permanently. While the epic hero experiences liminality, the ecstasy and the spirit journey is not a heroic attribute or goal, as there is no place in the aristotelian system for things that exist in between categories. While one might agree that the spiritual experience and naturally induced but supernaturally interpret experiences are questionable in their essence, Miller determines them as lesser or inferior entities. Miller does not address the animistic religious practises among this definition directly, but it is evident that he as a professor emeritus of comparative religion considers the ambition for researching them to be pseudo-scientific by default.⁴¹ While this statement is crafted in an attempt to stay neutral, accurate and quantifiable, the results can cause stomach ache to anyone who wishes to create topical science fiction in relation to our cultural history.

Miller admits that in the heroic tradition, the factual dependence of a young child and the importance of being nurtured and instructed by the mother is just bypassed, as matters of the

⁴⁰ Miller 2002, 63.

⁴¹ Miller 2002, 296-299.

adult world belong “unmistakably” to the father.⁴² Woman is by default a sexual or a marital partner to the Hero, and what you could call a mother’s domain is qualified under ‘fosterage’ to function as an “uncanny wet nurse” for the hero.⁴³ Actively sexual woman usually shortens the hero’s life⁴⁴ thus raping the women of the enemy is an inevitable scenario⁴⁵ and the younger sons in the family are of lesser status, meaning, “symbolically feminized”⁴⁶. As the hero reaches physical maturity, all other needs for further development are reduced to minor significance.⁴⁷

Definition of the heroic ideal can be seen to influence the suffocation of male portrayal. While Miller clearly states his attempt to collect data accurately and merely present it unemotionally, his approach is endlessly curious. There is a quantifiable prosocial reward for self sacrificial behaviour, this includes both care taking women who nurture their families even when they themselves are exhausted or otherwise in need, or men who embark to battles despite great odds of dying for their cause. The assumption of a certain God and an after life are reasonings for both starting wars and ending them. Only thing that Miller deems quantifiable is the Hero’s aim to become immortal, if not in reality, then in the tradition of storytelling. I find it extremely difficult to accept this reasoning, as overwhelmingly comprehensible this argument is. I do not wish to claim that Miller hates women and should somehow be held to account to this. I merely suggest that he is counting on his readers to take his research to be somehow conclusive while it definitely cannot be so.

⁴² Miller 2002, 90.

⁴³ Miller 2002, 95.

⁴⁴ Miller 2002, 128.

⁴⁵ Miller 2002, 110.

⁴⁶ Miller 2002, 102.

⁴⁷ Miller 2002, 85.

While definitions of masculinity and femininity are not absolute, they have been measured as such, and this measure is the subject of research. In *Sapiens - A Brief History of Humankind*, which was first published in Hebrew in 2011, Yuval Noah Harari shocked-treated the entire cognitive history of people. Evolution theory is often used to naturalise the torture of women, a reasoning which Harari contests. *"There is some universal biological reason why almost all cultures valued manhood over womanhood. We do not know what this reason is."*⁴⁸

The significance of physical dominance is still overemphasized in our contemporary culture, even while anyone can attain physical strength in relation to just about anybody, regards their gender. No matter their assumed physical limitations, women still engaged in hard manual labour along with men, while they were kept from positions of political and social power, while ability for appeasing, cooperation and manipulation are attributes women are often praised for. Harari admits this to be stereotypical – and perhaps there lies the reason why women nowhere have the military overpowered.⁴⁹ Harari also dares to contemplate whether *"the feminine genes that made it to the next generation belonged to women who were more submissive caretakers"*, which is problematic since it assumes submissiveness to be a genetic quality that can be passed on. In accordance with this analogy, women who did fight for power were apparently all killed before they could birth children, since they could not pass on their genes, while the men of similar quality apparently did. However, Harari detests the idea that men's ability to coerce women could be the key foundation for the most stable social hierarchy in history.⁵⁰

Meanwhile, men do continue to coerce women, as about 66 000 women are killed by men annually worldwide.⁵¹ In the United States alone, a rape is reported to happen every 6.2 minutes,

⁴⁸ Harari 2014, 172.

⁴⁹ Harari 2014, 175.

⁵⁰ Harari 2014, 173.

⁵¹ Solnit 2014, 71.

while as much as five times more rapes go unreported.⁵² There is no reason to suspect any country of men would do well in comparison. This amounts to tens of millions of rapes, and assumably to some millions of unwanted pregnancies. According to World Health Organization⁵³, 87 million women become unintentionally pregnant each year. While undoubtedly some of the pregnancies are pleasant surprises resulted from consent intercourse, the number of unwanted pregnancies cannot be anything other than devastating. Men continue to control and undermine a woman's right for consent sex and abortion, since in order for the patriarchy to survive, the descent "son must be the son of the father and not the son of the mother."⁵⁴ When we take this premise of existing oppression and remain mindful of it while we produce all writing, all subtext and all film set hiring procedures, we might witness the emergence of cinema that does not insult our intellect nor exclude anyone's experience, while addressing brutal violence that resides wherever we go.

The continuing problem Carrie Mathison in *Homeland*⁵⁵ has, is not that she is a spy, or that she is ruthless – but that she is a woman. She has adapted the skills of espionage, dedicating herself to protecting her country, continuously attempting to match the enemy powers she faces in her work. She is a bad mother, very much like her male colleague Peter Quinn is discovered during the series to be a bad father. Throughout the series seasons she attempts to balance her identity as a capable and ambitious intelligence analyst while admitting her faults as a mother. In order to effectively escape the assignment of a mere caretaker, passivity and servile nature all included, sometimes the safest and surest way to do so is to simply disregard motherhood from one's life. This is the great horror of the patriarchy: women refusing to birth and/or to nurture their children.

⁵² Solnit 2014, 22.

⁵³ Google search on 23.7.2019

⁵⁴ Murdock 1990, 113.

⁵⁵ Series by Showtime 2011-2020.

Women's movement is meant to shed light on the history of crimes against women and finally bring justice to criminals who have for years roamed without consequences. Helen Jacey defines a victim as someone who identifies herself through the abuse she has experienced, while a Heroine is someone who owns the authority in regards to her self-worth.⁵⁶ The starting point is that women are born whole and no matter what we face, we do not need to be broken, not even when our oppressors break us. Jacey calls for a discourse that rejects biology as our destiny - no matter what role and burden is bestowed upon us at the moment when our gender is defined at birth, it does not have to be our whole story.⁵⁷ While existing script writing manuals are not useless, when put under scrutiny, they are limited in regards to the feminine experience. This is why the need more researched feminist narrative theory, because in order for the Hero's Journey to become truly universal, it needs to intrinsically contain the experience of a woman instead of avoiding it.⁵⁸

Most books about the jungian psyche revolve around the mechanism of growing up and separating from the birth family in order to become independent. Even when we seemingly are nothing like our parents, we are different usually in relation to them. The Heroine attains her power after learning from the mistakes of the patriarchy. Instead of leaving her community to attain a magical boon that needs to be integrated to life back at home, the Heroine stays within her community, aiming for greater communion with the people around her instead of separating from them, striving for more agency that is deprived of her in order to harness her body and mind to serve men. In a male-orientated cultural setting, these processes are codified by gender.⁵⁹ It is possible to decode them.

⁵⁶ Jacey 2010a, 316.

⁵⁷ Jacey 2010a, 317.

⁵⁸ Jacey 2010a, 321-22.

⁵⁹ Jacey 2010a, 315.

Our culture is actually not male-orientated. It is not female-orientated either. There are no borders between us in the “natural world”. This does not eliminate the pressing need to reason with the male-orientated construct. There is a caregiver in all of us. We can become that even when we have not been mothered by our biological parents, and even when we don’t have children of our own. Writing about motherhood is impossible to avoid when writing about women and their place in the world, even in a film narrative set-up. I have to acknowledge how incredibly difficult it is for me to write about this. I am not a mother, nor I aspire to be. I and many women like me wish to identify as creators of meaning, rather than life. While I do not dream of a family, I do not consider myself to be a more of anything because of it (more free, more feminist, more artistic). I am keenly aware that there are biological mechanisms that are beyond my control. I might very well change my mind about becoming a mother when I meet a trustworthy man who expresses his wish to start a family with me. I am not afraid of having kids - *I am afraid of losing my agency*. The fear is terrorizing.

Jacey accords that it is possible to overlook implications of innate femininity or masculinity, and replace them with the need for **communion** and **agency**, in order to reject the repressive gender roles and become whole people.⁶⁰ This is how the female orientated narrative theory serves better than the preceding tradition, as it offers useful tools for writers who address also the male characters need for communion and growing in their roles as care-givers themselves.⁶¹ Then again, it can be argued that the care-giving attributes might be natural to the one with less power. This is the viewpoint that is can be obtained without assuming questionable ideas about whether women are more care giving because they have vaginas and because they give birth. Rather, the powerless take care of the ones in need of care because they have no agency to strive

⁶⁰ Jacey 2010a, 314.

⁶¹ Jacey 2010a, 318.

for whatever greater market shares everyone else is fighting over for. It could even be said that this lack of agency makes them more understanding of what is actually important in life. Becoming a parent and pursuing power outside the community do contradict each other, in regards of time and physical presence. We shouldn't worry that all women now want power and people will go extinct because of this. A lot of people want to raise families, a lot of people want to live a simple, happy life, and not chase serotonin highs with having power, money or fame on the expense of the poor, the oppressed and the planet. Life on our planet is actually endangered by the sheer numbers of yet more children, that all want to consume the already limited natural resources.

With this being said, while the effects of masculine agency can be seen to have taken a toll on life on Earth, agency over all does not stand for destructive masculinity. We can only know what feminine agency produces when we arrive to the actually equal utopia where women measurably have the same amount of power as men, not to even mention the dreams of a world where the majority of power would belong to women. This is what men will never give us, and perhaps women truly could not build a much better world even if they attained overruling power. It is extremely dubious to presume that women are innately more wise or stronger and kinder than men, meanwhile I do suspect that measurable power over others actually discloses wisdom, strength and kindness from co-existing with it. But I guess we will never know for sure.

Murdock addresses the meaning of the male caregiver, the father, as an ally and not merely as a monstrous patriarchal figure who wants to suck the life force out of women.⁶² A father can change the world and end the oppression by accepting his daughter as his equal and train and teach her like he would train and teach his son in a male oriented society. This does not mean rape flute training, but rather all the lessons on agency, such as figuring out the workings of the societal

⁶² Murdock 1990, 32.

system, providing for yourself and your family and protecting and preserving life on Earth. The wish to identify with the masculine energy is an essential step of individuation, because denying these basic needs leads to paralyzation.⁶³ This would indeed be harmful, because when paralyzed, a person stays and awaits to be rescued. This is not an option if we wish to fight the patriarchy. This is a self fulfilling prophecy; if we paralyze, we prove the patriarchy right. But he is not right. Women are not passive. Women are active. Women are everything.

Jacey continues her mission on defining storytelling and filmmaking that is feminist. In her 2010 book *The Woman in the Story: Writing memorable female characters* Jacey writes to a young, presumably ignorant writer, who bases all their practise to misogynist narrative theory. Jacey outlines four *superthemes*, stages of femininity all in variable relation to the system that exists now and the hopes for the future each branch comprehends. "*Familiar femininity*" represents female characters who do not fight the current and are not in a state of flux with their identity, because feminism has already "*righted some wrongs*" and "*isn't really necessary any more.*" The narrative does not aim shake up things too much, supposedly in order to depict the world as it is. The women might suffer, often because they have been betrayed in a merely personal sense. Usually some sort of King's knight is there to see that they're worth more than that. They deserve a reward for embracing their mystic femininity. "*You might think feminism wants everyone to be the same, and deep down, you don't think that's right.*"⁶⁴

A writer can be said to embody the quest to depict "*feel good femininity*" when her stories revolve around women's domestic relationships or just personal relationships. A-feel-good story might not become a tool of complicity, but it focuses on showing a world where things are getting

⁶³ Murdock 1990, 38.

⁶⁴ Jacey 2010b, 6-8.

better all the time, for women too. The feminist mission is somehow already completed under the umbrella of this narrative style, which means that women are free to redefine their femininity, and if their definition matches that of the man's definition of femininity, it's pure coincidence. With their sex toys and non-marital relations with men, critiques still accuse these characters for being conventional.⁶⁵

Under the category of "*fighting femininity*", the narrative's allegory of the real life battle against patriarchy is scarcely disguised. It does not matter if the writer has researched feminist theory, because her fiction obviously emulates the struggle. There exists a system that exploits the weak ones, and only a strong, not-surprisingly a female character is against all odds able to rise up and fight the power. This supertheme belongs to filmmakers in areas still fighting for equal rights in the eyes of the law. These films remind us that the fight isn't over and that our western equality is barely secured.⁶⁶

Finally, the definition of "*future femininity*" tries to envision a world where the gender conflict has been solved. All relation to the five-thousand-year oppression is invisible and the work is thus a remarkable feat of imagination. More often than not, the writer has been uncomfortable with the movement she was assigned at birth and if there are strong female characters in her story, she might even admit that she wrote them as men and gave them female names in order to avoid facing enforced inferiority status (obviously failing at this completely). The male characters are equally modern in their gender expression and nobody makes a big deal out of it, but again, all this is coincidental and there simply aren't any issues left to solve.⁶⁷

Jacey encourages to create a heroine "*who will launch thousands of viewers to their screens and will keep them there, gripped and entertained*" and recommends making a character

⁶⁵ Jacey 2010b, 9-11.

⁶⁶ Jacey 2010b, 11-13.

⁶⁷ Jacey 2010b, 13-15.

memorable by gifting her with a factor that is something the audience has never seen. This factor can be charming or annoying, the key is that it has to be addictive.⁶⁸ But I find myself asking myself: *is this my goal?* To serve a production company or a television distributor, to give the people what they want? If you want to *truly* throw off power you have to present *narratives* that are unknown or unpredictable, putting the audience in a position where they can't just sit back and drink in the narrative like it's air or water. They have to realise they are dreaming. They have to solve a problem. It has to be a moral problem and it has to happen inside their own heads. It is not about "is what I see against the law", it's about "is what I feel, when looking at this, in conflict with the common good?"

Jacey also, quite surprisingly and disappointingly, suggests that the audience relate the Heroine to their own experiences and expectations of what women are or should be like.⁶⁹ Is this true? There is no need to chastise Jacey for suggesting this if it happens to be actually happening. I only have difficulty accepting this, because I myself do not relate to fictitious male characters to my own experience with the men in my life. I relate to them in relation to myself. I think it's time to start a new spell: the audience will relate the Heroine to their own experiences and expectations of what it is to be a human, capable of complicated thought processes and justified moral choices.

Jacey does take a sort of stance for a change in the narrative, and offers to embrace films that are more about exploration of a certain theme or idea, rather than personal transformation. Transformation requires apostasis, a spiritual death, and this demand might exclude perfectly important stories from being told simply because the events in the life of a character do not end up consuming her completely.⁷⁰ Do we need to mentally and/or physically brutalise our characters

⁶⁸ Jacey 2010b, 17.

⁶⁹ Jacey 2010b, 29.

⁷⁰ Jacey 2010b, 69.

in order to feel a connection to them? Jacey also presents *layers of conflict* and the *layers of unity*, and using these layers simultaneously to create a reality where living naturally causes suffering, and peace is the ultimate boon. The layers of conflict and unity can be internal, related to the significant other of the main character, or her family, larger circle of community, the surrounding culture, the inhabited nation and, finally, the world.⁷¹ These tools can be used to craft stories that are not based on inherited/divine/royal (masculine) agency and give voice to agents that are not deemed powerful in a traditional sense.

The male dominance is a story which has been repeatedly told, but we can just start telling a different story. We have to assume that creating thoughtful truthful narratives will have a sort of ripple effect on what we deem to be quality cinema in a more equal world of the future. You might not ever be able to make up a story that has never been told before, so don't even try. You cannot be immortal. You can't even be important. Even if you manage to rustle up status, it does not make you more important than others. You can choose truth over corruption, you can be a strong link in a chain. And that should be enough.

⁷¹ Jacey 2010b, 124.

IV

JORDAN PEELE'S "GET OUT" AS AN EXAMPLE OF A MODERN MASTERPIECE WITH INHERENTLY INTERSECTIONAL MESSAGE THE CASE STUDY

It's inevitable that feminism will bleed on any papers composed by thoughtful women and men, and feminism can be mass produced and turn a profit to production companies that presumably also guarantee safe and equal grounds for filmmaking. Feminist content does have a demand, and it is on the rise, and one day it will be so thorough it will not even be called feminism. It will be called common sense, peace and quiet, the norm that needs to be protected.

I knew I wanted to write about feminist film narrative, and as soon as I came aware of this urge, I started bumping into writers and filmmakers already living this truth, like they were waiting for me to come home. 24 months after writing in my bachelor thesis that I can't write women characters because I hate myself, I was working in Berlin, in a gallery and studying experimental cinema, and my friend Georgie walked in. She came in with a book, that she called her bible. It was *Women who run with the wolves* by Clarissa Pinkola Estés. The book was published in 1992 and it took me a lifetime and six years in film school to find my way to it. I bought myself a copy of the book and read about the buried bones of wild women and predatory men with blue beards on the first chapters... I put the book down and the next movie I watched was Jordan Peele's *Get out*.

The compatibility between the film and this book can be quantified whether Peele himself knowingly worked with the book or not. It is also meritorious in regard to the analysis that the

main character of the film, Chris, is an assumed hetero sexual male. Even if Chris is not a woman, he is black skinned, a specification that is in no way a coincidence in a horror film about white supremacy. This is a story of a person being preyed upon because of attributes he is born with that makes him a target for unwarranted abuse. It is thus fair to imply in this context that feminist ideology can serve all people, despite their gender.

A typical hero who has inherited his domain and agency, and thus can be seen to be destined to face the perils he does. Most people on the planet cannot personally identify with this premise of having a royal position or power over others, and Peele does not apply it to Chris's story. I intend to show in my analysis that the finished film adapts the Bluebeard story archetype, but this narrative model is not that observable in the script. Peele won the Oscar for best original screenplay in 2018, an award that on an occurring occasion is given to someone who's primarily a director, rather than primarily a writer - and in this case, justly so. It's a film that is written so well it restores all faith to the future of narrative cinema that is stirring, on-point and provocative. It takes a subject that needs to be addressed - the looming reality of today's racism - and enforces it on full blast. Basically all possible criticism that sensitive white people might have for the dramatising of this story proves a status quo that exists to benefit not all, but the white-skinned.

In *Get Out*, a young black man, Chris, has fallen in love with a young white woman, Rose. Chris is a sensitive, kind and open minded person, aware of prejudice and still ready to open his heart. His perfect girlfriend turns out to be the worst possible psychopath, a white supremacist and a legioneer of a monstrous, family-run effort to enslave black bodies to be used as implant vessels for aging white people. She is the Bluebeard, the gentile seeming predator who lures her prey in a seductive, lulling manner.

Disney's "*Beauty and the Beast*" explains the Animal Groom's cruelty as a merciless curse, a snap punishment for a moment of cruelty. As the prince, turned beast, learns to treat his female prisoner with love and affection, she also falls in love with him despite his monstrous appearance, and love breaks the curse. The sinister message seems to be that women will be rewarded if they accept abuse and attempt to heal evil with their love. Clarissa Pinkola Estés is a psychiatrist and the advice of her book is directed for a reader who is looking to win over their *inner* demons and put their formerly negative energy into proactive use. She does emphasize that irredeemable evil does exist and it serves to be dismantled and not embraced.⁷²

Chris does manage to dismantle the Armitage terror on screen, but not in the original script. Peele has been open about his writing process and how he wrote many versions of the story in order to estimate the production realities of the film in a white society.⁷³ As I break down the final script version in comparison to the finished film, I aim to present Peele's process as an example of powerful filmmaking that is rooted in the feminist tradition while achieving the demands for intersectional practise⁷⁴. The analysis is composed of referencing the script⁷⁵ and the finished film and then observed in relation to introduced theorists, mainly Maureen Murdock's Heroine's Journey and the Bluebeard-chapter of Clarissa Pinkola Estés.

INTRODUCING THE UNSTRAINED PREDATOR

On screen: Andre Hayworth is abducted by a masked person, who the audience later learns to be Jeremy Armitage. The scene is truthful to a black person's experience of uneasiness in a white

⁷² Estés 1997, 64-65.

⁷³ Yuan & Harris, 2018

⁷⁴ International Women's Development Agency's definitions are included on their website.

⁷⁵ Link to Peele's script can be found at the sources list.

suburb, where they are either ogled at or straight up harassed. The scene functions not only as an enticing kick-off, but also as an effective use of dramatic irony. The audience knows now that everything is wrong as long as this abduction is not addressed.

As Andre is transported to the Armitage house, we only see the trees passing by a car window. The opening credits run to an ominous title song. The song is written in swahili, and translates to: *Listen to the ancestors. Run! You need to run far! Listen to the truth. Listen to the ancestors. Run! Run! To save yourself, listen to the ancestors.* This can obviously be seen as a warning about the heirs of white colonists and their violence, and also beautifully ties the film narrative to ancient stories.⁷⁶

We get to know the main character Chris Washington first through his artistic skills. He is surrounded by his artwork, a young artist, a capable man. Photography is his strength that comes to both burden him and help him throughout the story. The essential first dialogue is Chris's conversation with his white girlfriend Rose Armitage about their upcoming trip to her parents house. Has Rose told her parents Chris is black? Rose's response is what you could describe as 'perfect'. She kids about it and expresses how bad she feels that Chris has to worry about it. She calls her father a 'lame dad if anything else', who is going to want to talk about voting for Obama for the third time.

⁷⁶ Estés 1997, 23-24. "The spoken story touches the auditory nerve, which runs across the floor of the skull into the brainstem just below the pons. -- Ancient dissectionists spoke of the auditory nerve being divided into three or more pathways deep in the brain. They surmised that the ear was meant to hear at three different levels. One pathway was said to hear the mundane conversations of the world. A second pathway apprehended learning and art. And the third pathway existed so the soul itself might hear guidance and gain knowledge while here on Earth."

In the script: The film starts with a dinner scene of a white family that we do not meet again on the pages that follow, so no wonder it was not realised/included in the edit. The scene exhibits Peele's poetic artistry but basically serves no other purpose. The Shaw family discusses Disneyland, and how Mickey Mouse lives there; but also, that there is someone inside the Mickey costume, and how Mickey is always happy because he never ages. This scene, if embedded in the film, might have been disappointingly ineffective. It focuses on painting a picture of age neurosis, break out of white self involvement. It is true that white people are ignorant to racism-fueled offenses on their backyards and the powerlessness felt in the black community. That *is* a problem; white people not wanting to age is an absurd horror curiosity, that would blend out this message.

The script states Rose to be a nurse, and also that she acted on stage as a teenager, which explains why she is playing her role so perfectly. Preying on black men and submitting them to her father's devilish implantation schemes is way for Rose to enact both her passions and skills. The whole Armitage family can be seen as the antagonist force of the film, but Rose is the face of her family operation and Chris's planned demise. In the film, Rose's profession or inner passions are not mentioned. The exposition of her background does not really heighten the horrible revelation of truth about the Armitage family - pointing out her acting skills might actually make us suspect her more and harm the creation of suspense.

In relation to theory: Jeremy and Rose Armitage both represent the same murderous predator, that Chris needs to restrain in order to survive. The predator "desires superiority and power over others" and must work in secret, since what they aspire is unnatural and were they to practice

openly, they would be outcast from the general community. Their “fall” has already happened before Chris’s story begins and it explains why they hate the “light of others”⁷⁷.

THE UNSUSPECTING PREY

On screen: While driving up to the Armitage lake house, Rose snatches and throws Chris’s cigarette out the window. The whole family are health care professionals, Rose is a nurse (well, on the page anyway), her father and brother are doctors and her mother is a psychiatrist. Chris’s bad habit is a perfect excuse for them as they pursue him as prey and convince him to subject to hypnotreatment. During the drive Chris calls his friend Rod, who takes care of his dog, Sid. Rod works as a transportation security administration agent at the airport. Rod is a joker and humorously warns Chris about going to a white girl’s parents house. Thus far this is just silly banter about the interracial relationship of the two.

Then comes the real warning. A deer runs to the road and hits Rose’s windshield. The animal is not instantly dead and cries in agony. We later learn about Chris’s mother, who died in a similar way when Chris was young. She was a victim of a hit and run, who laid by the side of the road for hours before she died. Now, if Chris was at all superstitious, this could be reason enough to feel warned and turn back. But we do not live in a magical, symbolic world. We live in a reality where nothing means anything. It’s not sensible to get hung up on signs like this.

They call the police to report the accident and the police officer asks for Chris’s identification. Chris has not been driving the car and there is no apparent reason to ask for his ID. Rose stands up for Chris and stops Chris from submitting his ID needlessly. She is the epitome of a

⁷⁷ Estés 1997, 44-45.

perfect white girlfriend, who is at the same time supposedly unaware of Chris's discomfort for his skin color upon the trip in a manner suited for her own obvious white privilege, but also woke about societal discrimination.

At the drive way they pass Walter, "the grounds keeper", one of Rose's earlier victims who is now inhabited by Rose's grandfather, the inventor of the Coagula procedure. Chris is obviously not privy to this knowledge by now, and neither is the audience.

In relation to theory: In the Bluebeard myth, Rod's character can be seen as the projection of both the big sisters and big brothers⁷⁸ of the naive bride of Bluebeard, parts of the characters psyche who are more cautious of Bluebeard and in the end come to her rescue. Chris is an unmothered child. The naive bride of the tale is either unmothered or taught to submit by the mother. The mother colludes with Bluebeards intentions and "goes along the ride"⁷⁹. Chris tries to tell Rose the inquiry of the officer is no big deal. As a black man, he has been taught to act politely in order to avoid danger, and thus override his intuitions and plain understanding of what civil rights he has. Chris appreciates and admires Rose more than ever for standing up for him as they arrive to the Armitage house.

IGNORING THE LACK OF SECURITY

On screen: Chris meets his apparent future in-laws and Rose tells them about the accident with the deer. Dean and Missy are completely pleasant, but Dean especially is sick of deer and is grateful for Rose for accidentally killing one. Chris tells Dean he and Rose have dated for four

⁷⁸ Estés 1997, 39-43.

⁷⁹ Estés 1997, 49.

months, and Rose corrects him it has actually been five months, to what Chris admits to. 'Atta boy, better get used to saying that', Dean jokes. The whole family is actually joking and talking about Chris's abduction the whole time when they welcome him, introduce the house and their family history.

Dean gives Chris the tour of the house. Rose's brother Jeremy is presented first through his picture on the wall, along with grandpa Armitage, who used to be an Olympic athlete. Actually, he was beaten by African American athlete Jessie Owens in the qualifying rounds of the 1936 Olympics, where Owens later won the race in front of Hitler. 'He almost got over it'. This event obviously was the starting point for the racist idealism of the family, where they were humiliated to recognize the physical superiority of professional black athletes. They do not hate black skin tone, but envy what they see as fundamentally race related physical qualities. They want to abduct it and harness it for themselves. This is a very accurate analogy for today's racism, where white people might have black friends, but still insist on having "the N-word pass"⁸⁰.

'My mother loved her kitchen so we keep a piece of her in here.' Dean introduces Chris to the housekeeper Georgina, who is actually a host for Dean's mother. Georgina, much like Walter, acts very odd, but not odd enough for Chris yet to be alarmed. When they are alone, Dean apologizes to Chris for his white family having black servants, and what a cliché it is and how it must look. Dean also expresses his wish to vote for Obama for the third time if that would be possible. His white guilt is awkward but harmless. Meeting the white parents could not have happened in a more civilized fashion than this. **(In the script:** There are few differences in the way information is exposed in this sequence of the film compared to the script, but in accordance to theory it is of no great significance.)

⁸⁰ White people wanting to use a degrading word affectionately.

In relation to theory: Dean is actually the main predator, who is presenting Chris with all the keys to the castle, all but one: the basement is sealed off for ‘black mold’, and must remain locked.⁸¹

“The deceitful promise of the predator is that the woman will become a queen in some way, when in fact her murder is being planned.”⁸²

Maureen Murdock would refer the scene with Chris and Dean strolling together by the lake as the road of trials⁸³. According to Murdock, it manifests itself in a series of occurrences that attempt to undermine a woman’s need for equality and respect alongside with men and her attempts to abandon the subordinate role assigned to her by patriarchy. *“As they learn to anticipate others’ needs they consciously or unconsciously expect that their needs will be anticipated and taken care of as well.”* When they discover that their needs are *not* being considered, they give up so that the other may gain self. While Dean admits to seeming old-fashioned in order to cover up for his actual crimes, he knows that Chris has been trained to sacrifice his dignity and self-worth so that the person in power will leave him at peace. As Murdock writes, a person whose needs are not being met in any relationship have “the right to get out”.⁸⁴

THE NAGGING TRUTH

On screen: Later Chris, Rose, Missy and Dean are having ice tea on the porch. It is now mentioned for the first time that Chris’s mother has died. Missy clicks her glass three times with a spoon, establishing the audio cue for hypnosis. Chris seems a tad nervous, and they talk about Chris’s

⁸¹ Estés 1997, 40, 51.

⁸² Estés 1997, 50.

⁸³ Murdock 1990, 49.

⁸⁴ Murdock 1990, 53.

smoking. Missy's hypno treatment for smoking is 'a service they provide', if Chris happens to be interested. They also tell there will be a get together this weekend, Deans fathers 'shindig'.

Georgina is serving more tea and almost pours it over, in an attempt to draw Chris's tension and warn him about staying, obviously to no avail.

Jeremy arrives and they all gather for a family dinner. At first it seems like a nice time, but something is clearly wrong... Georgina stands in the kitchen statuesquely, Jeremy wants to wrestle Chris and praises his 'frame and genetic make-up'. Missy puts a stop to this since it is in the family's interest to keep Chris unharmed. On the surface even these continuous tacky comments of considering the pros and cons of supposed genetic tendencies are forming a string of stereotypical examples of things ignorant white people say to black people when justifying their supposed differences. This movie is a revolution. All these comments strung together like this, the depiction seems sadly more accurate than ever. When Rose and Chris retire to their room afterwards, Rose apologizes to Chris, slamming her whole family for their awkward, spuriously tolerant behaviour. Chris just thinks Rose's 'racial flow' is cute.

They go to bed, but Chris is having a hard time falling asleep. He thinks of the deer in the forest, and the whining of a mosquito in the room amplifies to resemble the cry of the wounded deer. The door to Rose's closet is seen hanging open, and while Chris looks at it, he is still unable to understand that his subconscious is warning him.⁸⁵ Chris sneaks outside, supposedly to smoke, and runs in with both Walter and Georgina. Walter is running in the yard, Georgina is posing in front of a reflecting window glass, both are definitely acting bizarrely. At this point, the film uses clear horror manners, and Chris is obviously freaked out.

⁸⁵ Estés 1997, 69.

Right after, Chris finds Missy in her psychiatrist office, all set and ready for him with her tea. Missy treacherously hypnotizes Chris with the tea cup as a focal point, and then she turns conversation swiftly from smoking to death of Chris's mother. Even when he doesn't want to, Chris starts to talk about the night it happened. It's raining, the TV is on. He doesn't call after her mother, does not inform anyone that she is late. It's Chris worst memory, a defining event that has made him who he is. He blames himself, hates himself for not being able to move. While he relives the events of the worst night of his life, the nervous tick - anxiously scratching the bed post - starts up again. Our birther, our Mother, is our link to our ancestors. To our lineage and our reason for being here. Chris's complex relationship to his mother is his weakness that enables him being preyed upon by Misty, but later on, this symptom of scratching becomes his strength that enables him to escape. When Missy asks Chris to sink into the floor, he is unable to resist her. The nightmare is realized, fully and completely. Missy has the power to completely control him and submit him to the will of the Armitage reign.

In the script: The closet door in Rose's bedroom is swung open by a howling drift. The closet is a twin to the Armitage basement, and behind these doors lies to truth about the monstrosities planned and later committed against Chris. A door functions as a psychic barrier, and the key to opening any door to the truth is to ask the right question.⁸⁶ In the script, Chris also sees the actual cellar door hanging open as he sneaks out to smoke - the whole house is coming alive and trying to tell him the truth, but Chris is nowhere near ready to hear this truth and just closes the door. He hasn't been smoking all day, and his withdrawal symptoms are distracting him at this moment when he should listen to his inner voice.

⁸⁶ Estés 1997, 52.

It is interesting that the door is already hanging open on screen. Perhaps it is prudent to refrain from any sort of “haunted house” logic which would not better the message about what is actually frightening about the Armitage household. Still, it can be assumed that Rose did not think it to be important to close her closet door, meaning, she is in no way guarding her secret. This should not be seen as sloppy behaviour on her part, though. In a predatory manner, she is arrogant, for she thinks she is so superior in regards to her prey. On the page, as they visit her room for the first time, she tells Chris openly how there are a lot of things he does not know about him. On screen, the only one expressing there could possibly be something wrong, is Dean. Rose again never says anything that could be seen as possibly threatening.

In the script, while Chris is being hypnotized and falls into the ‘sunken place’, he is impaled by a wounded deer’s antlers. This is not pictured in the film, perhaps in order to save the effect for when Chris wakes up in the house basement in the finale of the film, and sees the stuffed deer on the wall. Hitting the deer with Rose’s car was not a part of the Armitage plan, and it does not make sense for it to appear to Chris in the sunken place, that is controlled by Missy. The deer presents prey, presents Chris, and he should not be harmed by the deer.

In relation to theory: The hero must slay the Holdfast, the keeper of the past. In very much the same tradition, Murdock claims that the heroine’s first task is to separate from the mother in order to achieve individuation. The act of separation, no matter of the factual role the mother has played in preserving/destroying the patriarchy, shows the heroine that the mother is not the cause of feelings of inadequacy.⁸⁷ We cannot blame out mothers. We have to take responsibility for our lives. We must forgive our mothers. Murdock points that in many myths the mother has already

⁸⁷ Murdock 1990, 14-15.

passed away, is absent or is actually so vengeful and villainous she cannot be considered to represent any sort of mental home that must be abandoned in order to become a whole person.⁸⁸ This is due to the deep connection between mother and child. A mother's love and approval is mystical in a sense that it is holy, unconventional, total and sacred. It's too much to handle. It's easier to close it out than to use it as a starting point. It's too complex. It is impossible to abandon. This is why Missy perhaps is able to get under Chris's skin so effortlessly. Even if she is not his mother, Chris respects her as the mother of his loved one.

At the second act of the film, Chris cautiously starts to look for an explanation for all the bizarre occurrences at the house. In the Bluebeard myth, the key to the cellar starts to bleed, and will not stop bleeding until the truth is availed.⁸⁹

LEARNING TO TRUST ONE'S ABILITIES

On screen: Chris wakes up back in his bed to the sound of running water as Rose is taking a shower. Chris leaves his phone to recharge and goes out to take some pictures. His camera, his eye, is what makes him special, what makes him Chris, just as much as his mother's tragic passing, so it is very natural for him to try to find his balance and self-esteem after the horrifying night he has. At the yard, he again sees Georgina by the window, fixing her wig. Under her wig, and under Walter's cap, hides their operation scars. Georgina notices Chris and his camera, so Chris turns away. Chris curiosity and his instinct to take photos will come to his rescue in the end, but not yet. Chris also meets Walter in the yard who apologizes for his 'exercising' at night and asks about whether the anti-smoking treatment worked. The encounter is profoundly weird and

⁸⁸ Murdock 1990, 18.

⁸⁹ Estés 1997, 41, 53.

uncomfortable, and not least by the fact that Chris only remembers the events of the previous night after Walter mentions them. Back at the house, Chris tells Rose about Missy, his nightmares and the encounter with Walter. Rose is apologetic, but also jokes about Chris's concerns.

Cars start pouring into the yard; it's time for the get-together of family and friends who have arrived to the auction of Chris. Rose parades Chris around and the guests have a hard time keeping up the pretence that this is nothing but a social gathering. Gordon and Emily, Nelson and Lisa, April and Parker all ask inappropriate questions about Chris's good looks, physical form and sexual performance. Chris soon finds an excuse to stop mingling and Rose grants him that, very understandingly.

Now, while he is coasting alone, Chris meets Andre, a man we saw abducted in the beginning of the film. Andre acts and is dressed in a very different way and recognizing him is not a given at first and introduces himself as Logan. Chris meets Philomena, Logan's spouse, who is much older and pretty bourgeois. While it certainly explains Logan's own appearance, it does not make sense to Chris. Logan gives a little twirl to his friends, who applaud his looks. Chris does not understand what he is looking at. Chris then stumbles upon Jim Hudson of Hudson galleries, a blind art dealer. He expresses that he is a fan of Chris, compliments his 'eye', that he thinks is melancholic and powerful. He is himself a failed artist, turned art dealer. 'Life can be a sick joke'. 'Shit ain't fair'. Jim believes they 'could do wonderful things together'.

While this encountering could be seen as a promising work opportunity, Chris is now officially antagonized, measured by a man who is actually there to purchase him. Chris retires back to his room and all the guests quiet down as soon as he gets upstairs. Clearly the whole thing is a vacant parade, just for show. Upstairs Chris finds his phone unplugged and out of battery, and can't call Rod. Rose is there to sympathize with him, but this time does not seem able to say the

right thing to Chris. She leaves and Chris calls Rod. Chris recalls the events at the house to Rod who is immediately sure Logan is a sex slave and Chris is about to become one too. It is mostly a joke between them, but in fact Rod is absolutely correct. 'Black people out here like all them missed the movement.' 'They're probably hypnotized'. They hang up for now and Chris meets Georgina. Georgina apologizes for unplugging Chris's phone, and even when she's still acting very strangely, Chris still confides with her about becoming nervous with too many white people around. Georgina, the real Georgina, who is locked inside her own body, in the sunken place, tries her best to fight her way to the surface, to warn Chris, but obviously can't. Georgina assures Chris that the Armitages treat her well, smiling but with tears flowing to her face.

Chris joins the party and is now attempting to sneak a snapshot of Logan for Rod. One of the guests, Hiroki Takana, asks Chris about whether it's more advantageous or disadvantageous being African American. Chris asks Logan to reply to this question instead of him. While Logan tells the crowd of his pleasant African American experiences, Chris snaps a photo. He curses as his flash accidentally goes off and Logan freezes, his nose starts to bleed... Andre has woken up by the sudden flash and taken back his reigns - he charges at Chris and begs him to 'get out'.

Amazingly, Dean is able to explain the incident with all his neurosurgeon's authority. He says Logan had an epileptic seizure, which triggered anxiety and led to Logan attacking Chris for causing it. Missy 'talks' Logan down, and he seems to be back to normal as he returns to the party. He apologizes for his behaviour and leaves with Philomena to get some rest.

While the rest of the crowd continue with sparkles and bingo, Rose takes Chris out for a walk, which she probably would have done at this point no matter what. Chris tells Rose he does not believe Logan had a seizure, that he feels like he recognized Logan to be someone else when he changed, blames Missy's hypnotizing for bringing him all these bad thoughts... and begs Rose

to leave with him. Chris talks about his mother once more and admits to Rose, apparently for the first time, how he knew that he should have called after her, how he found out later that she survived the initial hit and died alone, bleeding in the side of the road, with nobody looking for him. Rose embraces him, and Chris promises to stay with her. They kiss. Then, Rose agrees that maybe in fact they should leave together. 'This sucks, let's go home, I'll make something up'.

Meanwhile, Dean auctions Chris back at the house, and Jim Hudson makes the highest offer.

In the script: The second act of the film is realized on screen very much according to the script, not to say that most of the film wouldn't be, but the more the story advances, the cleaner and tighter the script gets. While Chris and Rose talk however, in the script Rose pulls out the pregnancy card, and tries to distract Chris by letting him know she has missed her last period. Thankfully, this has been left out of the scene. Rose is not manipulating Chris by the usual, hateful and stereotypical measures the femme fatales of cinemas usually do, which would indeed be lazy. She manipulates him by being perfect, as always.

In relation to theory: In the tale, Bluebeard's bride is stuck with her bleeding key after nosing around according to her big sisters encouragement and attempts to stop the bleeding with horse hair, ashes, heat and cobwebs⁹⁰ - and nothing helps. Her initial reaction is to hide her own fouls and continue her life with her Animal Groom. Chris is so bewildered by his own past stirring up that he does not recognize the true source of his uneasiness.

⁹⁰ Estés 1997, 41.

THE SNARE SNAPS AROUND

On screen: While getting packed to leave, Chris sends the snapshot of Andre/Logan to Rod, who calls him right back. Rod has recognized Andre, and as he learns his name, Chris remembers him too. This seems to prove Rod's theory about sex slaves and Chris is finally convinced of the theory too, and Rod begs him to escape. Chris looks about him in the room one more time - and finally, goes on to check out Rose's closet. Chris finds a stack of photos, pictures of Rose on stage, acting... and then all the pictures of previous black boyfriends... There are so many, while Rose claimed he was the first black man she dated... and among the pictures, there is Walter... and Georgina... Rose's spoils.

Rose walks up to the scene, catching Chris in the act, but still acts like there is nothing out of the ordinary. Chris manages to hide his terror. Rose is looking for the car keys, they are nowhere to be found. Misty offers tea, she has her cup and spoon ready. Rose plays her part to the very end. She finds the keys but she cannot give them to Chris. He can't leave. He can't get out. Missy clicks her cup three times with the spoon. It's over. The audio cue drops Chris right back into the 'sunken place', and he is unable to fight as Dean and Jeremy carry him to the downstairs basement.

Chris wakes up in the basement, tied to a chair. On the wall there is a stuffed deer head with antlers. His initial warning. Chris is terrified. And then the TV comes on... 'Is there anything more beautiful than the sunrise?' Grandpa Armitage walks him through the upcoming procedure. Coagula procedure is a man made miracle their order has developed for many many years. Behold;

they're all there.... Grandparents, Dean, Missy, and little Jeremy and Rose... With a click of the spoon on screen, Chris again loses his consciousness.

Rod can't get a call through to Chris. He searches the web for Andre Hayworth and finds out that he has been missing for months now. Rod goes to file a missing person's report to the police, to an African American female detective Latoya. She appears to agree to listen to him when she hears Chris is missing after dating a white girl. Rod explains his theory as best as he can about the Armitage family abducting black people, brainwashing them and making them work as sex slaves. The detective gathers two colleagues to listen. Rod talks about his own TSA detective work, evidently further harming his credibility. After he is done, all three officers laugh at him, straight to his face. 'Oh white girls, they get you every time'. Even if they are members of the minority personally, a police once again cannot be trusted to help a brother out.

Rod calls to Rose and tries to pry information from her. Rose lies about Chris leaving two days ago, paranoid and upset, leaving his phone behind. Rod starts to record the call, but Rose is onto him and starts to accuse Rod for harrasing her, saying he wants to fuck her - Rod hangs up and has to admit that Rose is genius for pulling that one.

Tied in his trap, Chris's nervous tick is back on, as he anxiously scratches the arms rest. He has clawed through the cover and the stuffing of the chair is coming out. He leans in to take a look of the stuffing and then has the idea to stuff his ears so that the focal point will not hypnotize him the next time he is submitted to it. At this point, his rouse is not revealed to the audience. A pre-operation video chat with Jim is broadcasted to him next. Jim says he couldn't care less about race, who is superior, who is not, and tries to comfort him. 'You won't be gone. -- You'll live --',

and Chris continues his sentence, 'in the sunken place'. Why us? Why black people?' 'What I want is: deeper. I want your eye, man. I want those things you see through.'

Dean in preparing for the plantation surgery, Jeremy as his aid. Dean cuts away Jim's scalp and removes the back of his skull. Jeremy takes a wheelchair and goes to get Chris. When the moment is perfect, and he is untied, Chris gets up behind Jeremy's back and smashes his head with what appears to be a pétanque ball. He removes the cotton from his ears, looks at the deer on the wall... *Sikiliza*.... Chris goes upstairs and pierces Dean to the antlers of the deer. In effect, Chris uses the prey of the hunter as a weapon against him. Dean is dead.

Georgina sees Chris covered in blood and runs. Next, he runs into Missy, and breaks her cup, so she can't hypnotize him. She fights him with a letter knife, but Chris soon overpowers her. He apparently stabs her in the eye with her own knife, but we don't see this on screen. It's clear what happens to her, even if she is not brutalized on screen. Jordan Peele deserves a thank you for that choice.

Jeremy attacks Chris once again, and Chris now takes him out properly. Meanwhile, Rose is upstairs, in her domain, with all the pictures of his victims now on the wall, planning on new ones. Chris gets into Jeremy's car and while phoning for help he accidentally drives over Georgina. He can't help but think of Georgina tearing up, desperately trying to rise above the sunken place, reminding him of the faith of her mother, so he picks her up while she is unconscious. Rose has now noticed the noises and goes after Chris with a shotgun. Grandma/Georgina becomes conscious and attacks Chris, who crashes the car. Walter races up to Chris and crashes him to the ground. Chris still has the phone, and he snaps a picture of Walter. The flash makes him snap out of his hypnosis, like Andre did before. Rose fails to see this, so when Walter asks for the shotgun, she gives it to him. Walter shoots Rose in the stomach and immediately turns the shotgun to his

own head and kills himself. Chris tries to strangle Rose but is somehow unable to do it. He doesn't buy Rose's pleas or assurances for love... but as she stares him while strangling her, she manages to get some kind of hold over him. Hypnosis? Love? And at this most excellent hour - blue and red lights flash. And the audience is devastated... Chris, with blood all over him, on top of a white woman, begging for help, a shotgun by his side. This is not going to end well for Chris. Who would believe him? But... It's not the cops. It's Rod. In his TSA car. 'I told you not to go into the house'. Rose watches them drive off and the life escapes her eyes. The Era of the Armitages is over.

In the script, everything does go wrong. 'Get Out' premiered in 2017, after the most fatal yearly numbers of black casualties of unnecessary and lethal force used by the U.S. police⁹¹. While the audience is certain at this point that Chris will be killed, he does survive on page, but the whole house and the evidence burns, and Chris goes to prison. Either due to some sort of amnesia from all the mental suggestion he has been through, or simply the sheer exhaustion of the whole event, Chris can't even give Rod the names of the people in the party. He is jailed for life, but is at peace with his deeds. Gladly, this is not the way Peele finished his film. Chris's escape is a bit different in the script, and he is strangling Rose already in the basement where he is also helping to prep him for the operation. In the script, she is depicted as psychotically smiling, enjoying being strangled by Chris before passing out.

In relation to theory: Chris looking into Rose's closet parallels with Bluebeard's bride using the forbidden key to open a door to her groom's cellar and discovering the bones of previously

⁹¹ Craven, The Huffington Post 2016. Swaine & McCarthy, The Guardian 2017.

murdered brides.⁹² Chris is figuratively bled to death, decimated. The horse hair not stopped the key from bleeding, it has made it bleed even more. The truth is out, but it only hurts more and helps nothing. The blood the key bleeds can be seen as the endless river of blood of all who came before him. Because Chris himself is played out, Rod takes the stage, and he leads the story in the following sequence. In the mythology of the preyed, Rod equals now to the big brothers of the naive bride, whom she cries out for aid as she prepares to die. The bride has no other choice but to submit to her death, and she asks her groom if she can have a moment to pray and ready herself for her death. The predator admits this to her, not because he is merciful or even pities her, but because he is arrogant and knows his superiority.⁹³ Chris is in a boiling point, where is a victim of violence but also aware of his own naivety. As the bride's life force bleeds out, severe fatigue sets in, but "to go to sleep now is certain death".⁹⁴ His 'genetic make-up' aids him as he physically fights his abductors one by one, but in the end, he is saved by Rod. Rod represents a force that is more wise and cautious by default and able to act when it comes time to "kill off malignant impulses."⁹⁵

I cannot help but applaud Peele for the writing of Jim Hudson. A story which relates to racism in today's Western civilization, Peele manages to create an imaginative and surprising psychosis to explain Hudson's complicity. Jim wants Chris's artistic eye for photography, and means to steal this from him along with his physical body, because the eye, along with the rest of the brain is the organ that works as a gate between the physical world and the immaterial mind. Peter Godfrey-Smith writes about the intelligence and possible consciousness of animals in his 2018 book *Other Minds*, and considers it to be a sign of intelligence that the "*octopuses are also*

⁹² Estés 1997, 41.

⁹³ Estés 1997, 55-63.

⁹⁴ Estés 1997, 60.

⁹⁵ Estés 1997, 43, 61-63.

interested in objects that they pretty clearly know they can't eat." Godfrey-Smith also suspects that the last known ancestors of humans and octopuses might have had, among other qualities, *"simple eyes, or at least light-sensitive patches"*⁹⁶ and goes on to point out how *"an octopus's eye is similar to ours. It is formed like a camera, with an adjustable lens that focuses an image on a retina."*⁹⁷ -- *Light, for a living thing, has a dual role. For many it is an intrinsically important resource, a source of energy. It can also be a source of information, an indicator of other things."*⁹⁸ This scene, the way it was written and realized on screen, where light and the art of photography is the highest reward and the pillar of one's individuation for both Chris and Jim, in my opinion is why Peele won the Oscar.

NOTES ON BRUTALIZATION

Roxane Gay writes about about Quentin Tarantino's *Django Unchained* (2012) and Steve McQueen's *12 Years a Slave* (2013) in her book *Bad Feminist* (first published in 2014). Tarantino's film can be seen to be the director's *tour de force* of western genre cinema, and while the lead actor is black skinned, it's very much a film made for white people, by white people. The revenge for slavery is a curiosity. As Gay proclaims, a satisfactory revenge in her opinion *"would involve the reclamation of dignity on my own terms and not the "generous" assistance of benevolent white people who were equally complicit in the ills of slavery."*⁹⁹ Gay also critiques *12 years a Slave*, while admitting it *"is remarkable because it is the only film to date that is based on a slave's own account of his experience"*¹⁰⁰ and *"is also the first major studio-backed slavery film helmed by a black*

⁹⁶ Godfrey-Smith 2018, 5.

⁹⁷ Godfrey-Smith 2018, 10.

⁹⁸ Godfrey-Smith 2018, 17.

⁹⁹ Gay 2014, 225.

¹⁰⁰ Gay 2014, 228.

director.” Nonetheless, Gay calls out for films that are “*beyond the struggle narrative*.”¹⁰¹ We are taught that assembling powerful men and weak women on screen we create contract, raise the stakes without much effort. Gay defies the normalizing of the narrative. “*I am worn out by broken black bodies and the broken black spirit somehow persevering in the face of overwhelming and impossible circumstances*.”¹⁰²

With this in mind, I go back to experiencing Missy’s execution in Peele’s *Get out*. We didn’t even see it happen on screen, not really, and while I applaud that, I don’t know if I would have been broken up about it if I had seen it realized. I am white, she is white. She had it coming. I would have done it too. I can appreciate her being killed off screen on an intellectual level. But I am not broken up about it. I don’t feel exhausted by it. I’m even a worse feminist than Gay claims to be¹⁰³, far, far worse. This tells me about my privilege. Even though the white female’s are often brutalized on screen, I do not shy away from it on a personal level. Perhaps it has something to do with my own experience as a woman. It has twisted what I feel is natural and normal. I am part of the problem in a way that I have allowed my personal experience as a woman and a subject of violence and harassment to harden me to an extent that I cannot no longer acknowledge a problem that is normalized. Chris is *de facto* a victim that rises to rival his enemies and defeats them, protecting himself, but has no chance to really feel empowered or safe, or to be seen - not in the course of his story anyway. We only wish and assume that everything will be alright with him after the story ends. He didn’t overuse power or violence, so we know his spirit is uncorrupted, even when he is brutalized in all other possible ways.

¹⁰¹ Gay 2014, 231-232.

¹⁰² Gay 2014, 231.

¹⁰³ Gay 2014, xi.

My hope is that this analysis shows the reader an example of a film narrative that runs on the terms of power and privilege versus systematic oppression and fleshes out how insane our reasonings for violence and isolation of power is. The possibilities for a whole library of film analysis based on feminist narrative theory remain virtually untapped and such work could lead into the creation of an art form that does not repeat propaganda and cash in on human suffering, but depicts the existing mentality truthfully while transforming it's audience with knowledge of defects and presenting the view point of a character we unlike the heroes we are accustomed to.

V

ENLIGHTENMENT BEYOND GENDER**THE CONCLUSION CHAPTER**

Defining a so called feminist film narrative, an alternative to the classical Hero's journey, that encompasses the demands of fourth wave feminism, is a task riddled with dangers. To think there is a gender specific quality to any narrative, means we have to assume gender norms to an extent and validate certain claims about gender hormones. Reading Campbell or Vogler, or Murdock or Estés, reveals our psyches archetypes and myths to us, making one aware of things that already affect us, whether we personally ascribe to jungian mentality or not. Most of the books I referenced in this thesis are not written about film narrative, for example Murdock and Estés write about their findings while working as psychoanalysts. What psychoanalysts do attain in their work is the oral history of being mistreated in one's community. Researching these books offers a new perspective to what feminist cinema can be, while disregarding biological reasoning for brutalization from the discussion is still left for the reader, since these theorists start from requalifying assumed gender.

These books, and also filmmaking for that matter, are not only about telling a story, but repeating a mechanism. Repeating, possibly, a mechanism that is rooted in our society so deeply, we don't even notice it. A feminist screenwriter has a life long career ahead of her as she starts telling women's stories and correcting misconceptions that we have of women. The patriarchal monolit, an era of measurable consistency of men's power leading up to today, has governed for five thousand years.¹⁰⁴ Respect for life and natural limits has been secondary to

¹⁰⁴ Murdock 1990, 79.

production-orientation and male domination. A lifestyle that somehow manages to be separate of this rule is uncharted, difficult to imagine.¹⁰⁵ Feminist research reaches back to prehistorical times in order to imagine elements of mythology that existed before the Greek division of power into multiple gods. This was a time when the role of woman was to protect human life and the sacredness of nature.¹⁰⁶ We trace our steps back to the beginning in order to be free from men's demands of us, and we find agency. We find more than one mission to be attained in a single lifetime. We become the Heroine that all of the world looks up to, listens to and respects. The predator resides in power, which his forefathers took and passed to him. He is not trained to think, because he never had to justify himself. It might take him a lifetime to see that what was committed long ago was a crime and that he is not above the rest of us. He might never admit this. We cannot wait for his temperance. The predator does not deserve to be forgiven - but we deserve to heal. The system that produces our pain remains unchanged. The white american capitalist will never establish universal health-care, outlaw guns or allow abortions because it would lead to creatures he deems lesser than him living longer and happier.¹⁰⁷ Women like myself indulge in all the essential privileges of our brothers and while we are entitled to it all, our comfort doesn't automatically amount to a truly good world.¹⁰⁸ To consider the feminist mission completed is a perceptual illusion as much as it is an illusion that capitalism has created more wealth than inequality in the world.

¹⁰⁵ Murdock 1990, 80.

¹⁰⁶ Murdock 1990, 143-144.

¹⁰⁷ Lorde 2007: 119. "Some problems we share as women, some we do not. You fear your children will grow up to join the patriarchy and testify against you, we fear our children will be dragged from a car and shot down in the street, and you will turn your backs upon the reasons why they are dying."

¹⁰⁸ Lorde 2007, 118. "White women face the pitfall of being seduced into joining the oppressor under the pretense of sharing power. This possibility doesn't exist in the same way for women of color."

In the first essay - the second chapter of the thesis - titled *The wounded masculinity and the oppressed femininity* I reintroduced the ancient, magical ritualistic phenomenon behind the mainstream cinema system and attested it to function primarily as a commercial tool rather than in terms of what kind of message it offers to audience to integrate to their everyday mentality. I argued what sort of mechanisms capitalism creates if incorporated to fictional narratives, and came to the conclusion that this oppressing mechanism thrives on powerless people remaining powerless. I inspected what masculinity is beyond the biological gender and what kind of behaviour results from narrow and wounded fictional depictions of masculinity. Maureen Murdock's research on how gender traits are defined, taught and what purpose they serve offered a base for this work. Betty Friedan's debunking of the feminine mystique argued the similarities between the housewife image that women embraced to a male created fetish version of womanhood and what kind of spiritual suffocation it has created. I propose that there actually is no threat towards the traditional nuclear family in order to draw attention to the true cause behind criticism towards feminism. Women's movement remains marginalized as long as it seems to function solely on terms of masculine fear of losing or even simply sharing power.

My core findings results to disregarding biological gender as the primary signifier of one's identity and it's meaning in the journey making narratives. The end goal is not to deny the existence of gender, but to challenge the spectrum gender is observed on. I wanted to acquire an alternative to this school of thought, and even when I appreciate the female orientated theory, the paradigms ambition to transcend gender remains incomplete. Referencing Yuval Noah Harari and Rebecca Solnit was crucial for deposing power or the lack of it as a more relevant influence in society in general as well as a subject in storytelling. Identifying as powerless is not an appealing dogma, but as Helen Jacey argues, addressing it can lead to empowerment from victimhood, an

essential step towards true equality and improved quality of life. All the while I also contemplate on motherhood, and how this sacred life mission is subjected to serve men's ambitions at the expense of women's rights.

In the second essay - the third chapter of this thesis - titled *Why we need men and women is not why you think* I represented more of Jacey's newer film theory. Jacey's premise for her writing was the claim of existing narrative theory being masculine biased. Inspired by this notion, I dismantled Dean A. Miller's epic hero. Writing about Miller rather than Joseph Campbell interested me more, since Miller himself takes such pride in remaining the more credible theorist. Miller's writings enabled me to focus on the theory rather than to the person behind the theory, as he refrains from qualifying his subject, unlike Campbell who deemed women to be inherently not as driven as agents. Qualifying men over women is easy to debunk, but proving that the existing data on male heroes escapes comprehension in regards to life's complexity allows the screenwriter to rephrase her tradition completely.

Moving on I focused on representing more of Jacey's work, including dramatic tools such as communion and agency. These tools enable to depict care giving and active operating in a film narrative as missions that apply to all people despite their gender, not forgetting the highest reward of wholeness as a premise in both fictional stories and in our reality. Maureen Murdock's representation of allied father figure reminds that women will always need men to take care of them, just as much as they need us.

While Jacey encourages more experimental narratives as a means to create content, I still found her theory to remain normative in a production value set-up. If feminism would focus on overthrowing power rather than just overthrowing what we apparently think about men and women, the resulting narrative tools might still remain to be discovered. Still, Jacey's suggestion

on using layers of conflict and unity create a fine base for challenging, complicated and diverse storytelling. Also, Jacey's four feminine superthemes as measures for film analysis will definitely produce sharp analysis if broadly used.

I still chose Clarissa Pinkola Estés's mythology as my primary tool for analysing Jordan Peele's *Get out* as my case study, included as the fourth chapter of this thesis, titled *Jordan Peele's "Get Out" as an example of a modern masterpiece with inherently intersectional message*. This was purely because it personally produced more original thinking than any other theory, even if Estés writes about specifically female psyche's archetypes. *Get out* again seemed to be a perfect subject of research, especially when comparing the female orientated theory to a male character's story, and the pairing of these variables abled me to fulfill the definitions of intersectional feminism that will not uphold any questionable social system, just like Reni Eddo-Lodge insisted.

Filmmaking is not just a business, or a privilege, or entertainment on demand - it's a need. Online streaming services have harmed the deed of communion in film theaters, but it has opened a possibility for intensive personal tripping and released people from the shared, corporate established schedule. The table is set and it's beautiful - and the need for new content is never-ending. The solution already exists, the cure for the anxiety exists, and the paralyzation dissipates.

I have been to film school for 7,5 years when I graduate. I should have been done in 5, but coming from where I'm coming from, I really needed the extra time. I have a huge wound of mistreatment in me. I wanted to conform to the transformation mythos, I wanted to feel something, to feel whole and feel connected to my body. I wanted to learn the rules and become a professional who rides on top of the trend. I feel the Hero's journey paradigm does not work as a

transformative measure for me and I doubt it will work like so for anyone at all. Experience does transform you, tragedies do tear you, and as a woman or a minority member, you will be torn. The idea that one will meet their predestined faith forever unknowingly is not a psychology I am interested in. The jungian theories have served their purpose. Part of the feminist theory is acknowledgement that the world is torn, mixed, in flux, complicated, ever changing. And our narratives should be too. Our narrative needs to be true, it needs to change with us and it can actually teach us ways of seeing the world that will lead to production of better cinema. The hunter's instinct is there, under our *rational* knowing that includes knowledge on surviving without mindlessly killing agents around us. We don't have to kill in order to survive. We all do not have to reproduce in order for the species to continue. We don't even have to reproduce in order to know what love, affection and care giving is. We live in a world where those problems are solved. I might be coming off as a new age cliché and an art house trickster and I don't mind. This is something I learned during my long education and you should probably pay hear to what I propose here. I hope the future film schoolers will learn the tradition of narrative like I did, but I wish they would be taught the criticism and hope for something better as the default and not the enlightened after thought.

There will always be conflict. We always have to find away to solving those conflicts. This is the reason why people won't stop making films. This is the reason why computers will never replace us as artists. Even if a computer manages to replicate making art so well it is indistinguishable from human made art, even if the computer becomes aware of itself and can actually produce evolved thinking, thinking evolved beyond our ability – it will not take away human's incentive to solve human conflicts. How could it?

SOURCES

Literary sources

Agee, James. & Evans, Walker 1976. *Let Us Now Praise Famous Men*. Ballantine Books, Random House, New York.

Eddo-Lodge, Reni 2018. *Why I am no longer talking to white people about race*. Bloomsbury Publishing, London.

Estés, Clarissa Pinkola 1997. *Women who run with the Wolves*. A Ballantine Book, The Random House Publishing Group, New York.

Friedan, Betty 2010. *The Feminine Mystique*. Penguin Classics, London.

Gay, Roxane 2014. *Bad Feminist*. HarperCollins Publishers, New York.

Godfrey-Smith, Peter 2018. *Other Minds: The octopus and the evolution of intelligent life*. William Collins Paperback, London.

Harari, Yuval Noah 2014. *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. Vintage Books, Penguin Random House, London.

Jacey, Helen 2010a. *The Hero and Heroine's journey and the writing of Loy*. Journal of Screenwriting, Volume 1 Number 2. University of the Arts, London.

Jacey, Helen 2010b. *The Woman in the Story: Writing memorable female characters*. Michael Wiese Productions, Studio City.

Lorde, Audre 2007. *Sister Outsider: Essays & Speeches by Audre Lorde*. Ten Speed Press, Berkeley.

Mason, Paul 2016. *Postcapitalism: A Guide to Our Future*. Penguin Books, London.

Miller, Dean A. 2002. *The Epic Hero*. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London.

Murdock, Maureen 1990. *The Heroine's Journey*. Shambhala Publications, Boulder.

Plato, 1999. *Platon: Teokset, Kolmas osa*. Otava, Keuruu.

Solnit, Rebecca 2014. *Men Explain Things to Me*. Haymarket Books, Chicago.

Vogler, Christopher 2007. *The Writer's Journey: Mythic Structure for Writers*. Michael Wiese Productions, Studio City.

Secondary sources

Trujillo, Nick 1991. *Hegemonic Masculinity on the Mound: Media Representations of Nolan Ryan and American Sports Culture*. Critical Studies in Mass Communication, Volume 8, London.

Lectures

Larlar, Fulten 2018. *Living up to Your Grandfather's Expectations: The dramatic analysis of Darth Vader and Kylo Ren characters in Star Wars I to VII, in terms of conscious goals, actions, and the grey area defined by the avoidance of responsibility* Screenwriting Research Networks conference in Milan, Italy. 13.-15.9.2018.

Websites

International Women's Development Agency

<https://iwda.org.au/what-does-intersectional-feminism-actually-mean/>

Jordan Peele's script

<https://static1.squarespace.com/static/54e8f9b7e4b0c4f915fa6e19/t/5a9a2af28165f558740b2fd2/1520052979310/get-out-2017.pdf>

Online articles

Craven, Julia. *More than 250 black people were killed by police in 2016*. The Huffington Post, 1.1.2017

https://www.huffpost.com/entry/black-people-killed-by-police-america_n_577da633e4b0c590f7e7fb17

Swaine, John & McCarthy, Ciara. *Young black men again faced highest rate of US police killings in 2016*. The Guardian, 8.1.2017.

<https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jan/08/the-counted-police-killings-2016-young-black-men>

Yuan, Jada & Harris, Hunter 2018. *The First Great Movie of the Trump Era*. Vulture.

<https://www.vulture.com/2018/02/making-get-out-jordan-peelee.html>